

ALEXANDER THE GREAT: 'LAST OF THE ACHAEMENIDS'?

Robin Lane Fox

Introduction

'The last of the Achaemenids' is an arresting phrase to apply to Alexander, their Macedonian conqueror. It was first applied to him, with due caution, by Pierre Briant in 1979. 'Premier d'une longue lignée des rois hellénistiques? Certes! Mais je crois qu'au regard de l'histoire du Proche et du Moyen-Orient du 1er millénaire, Alexandre peut être considéré aussi comme "le dernier des Achéménides".'¹ By 1996, the phrase had become part of the conclusion to his great history of the Persian Empire, at least with a territorial emphasis. As the last king to rule from Egypt to India, 'from the point of view of Near Eastern imperial geopolitics, Alexander was indeed "the last of the Achaemenids"'.² I wish, here, to play further with the phrase and use it as a spring-board towards Alexander's aims and impact.

Eight years after capturing the Persian king's family, Alexander did marry two royal Persian brides, one from each side of the recent Achaemenid line. As he died childless by them, he was, in a genealogical sense, 'the last' in those family-trees. The phrase also fits quite well into parallel tendencies in studies of Alexander and the Successors. It seems to minimize him, as if he changed very little, except for all the bloodshed which moralists now deplore. A minimized Alexander suits those who wish to emphasize his Successors instead, rulers who (on this view) were the real city-founders and even the real multi-culturalists in contrast to a hasty and (supposedly) chaotic Alexander. As the 'last of the Achaemenids' Alexander is the final chapter in the 'long imperial age' of the Persians, whereas the hellenistic age marks a new start. He can even be kept out of purely Greek history. This sort of suggestion goes back to George Grote but is exemplified by P.M. Fraser's recent study of Alexander's cities. After chapters of brilliant hellenistic scholarship Fraser (a purist on such ethnic questions) concludes that Alexander was primarily a Macedonian. He is, therefore, 'cool' towards 'the Greeks' (with the implication, for Fraser, he was not one himself) and was not a philhellene but an 'anti-Hellene'.

۱۳۸۳

PERSIAN
RESPONSES
*Political and Cultural
Interaction with (in)
the Achaemenid Empire*

Edited by
Christopher Tuplin

Contributors

Lindsay Allen, Gabriel Danzig,
Wouter F.M. Henkelman, John O. Hyland,
Kristin Kleber, Robin Lane Fox, Dominique Lenfant,
Alan B. Lloyd, Frédéric Maffre, Eric A. Raimond,
Margaret Cool Root, Nicholas Sekunda,
St John Simpson, Christopher Tuplin, Phiroze Vasunia



The Classical Press of Wales

۴۹-۱۳-۸۸

Instead he was, in Fraser's view, philo-Cyrus (the word φιλόκυρος was applied to him in antiquity, but only once, by Strabo in a decidedly rhetorical flourish), and his Alexandrias (just six in number, according to Fraser) projected an 'Irano-Macedonian continuity'.³ In Achaemenid studies, this 'continuity' is very congenial to revisionist studies of the empire's later years and its supposed strength and coherence. The empire was not strong enough to defeat Alexander even when his army was massively outnumbered, but did it then absorb him, the 'last' in its very long *durée*?

We need to outline what was Achaemenid before we look at Alexander from this angle. A connection to the royal dynasty is important, with the proviso that the inventor of the Achaemenids is Darius I, a long lifetime after the Persian conquests began to affect Asia.⁴ Among the characteristics of what became Achaemenid rule, we would include the king's special relationship with Ahura Mazda, the claims (at least) to rule over the world, the strong emphasis on 'Persia' and 'Persians', the use of a satrapal system, the itinerant court moving from palace to palace, the roads and the elaborate ration-system which characterized the king's court and probably the satraps' local entourage too. But this ration-system is a warning to Achaemenid historians. It was prominent in the Achaemenid era, but by origin it was not distinctively Achaemenid, no more than the detailed categories of land-tenure or the royal judges that are known in Achaemenid Babylonia or the Achaemenid courtiers' practice of *proskynēsis* or (in the private sphere) the formulas for divorce in legal texts from Elephantine under Achaemenid rule.⁵ Of course these items had an important life, and perhaps a distinctive meaning, in the totality of Achaemenid culture, but if we find one of them attested under or after Alexander, this persistence is not necessarily an Achaemenid debt, nor does it make him the 'last Achaemenid' any more than such debts made Cyrus or Xerxes the 'last Assyrian'. We also need to consider the office-holders, not just the names of their job. It matters whether a Greek, not a Persian, holds a previously-known title, property or estate: onlookers would not be struck first by 'Achaemenid continuity' when new faces, with new manners, owned their land or guarded their treasure, albeit in the same places.

Alexander's contemporary historians did present him as rivalling, or respecting, Persian kings and adopting Persian customs at particular points in his career: I shall begin by surveying these explicit contemporary debts, together with some of the recent interpretations which have tried to add to them. Do they make Alexander the 'last Achaemenid' or not? I shall then turn, necessarily only in outline, to the big (and ill-documented) question of continuities in imperial rule. Suppose the Iranian father of one of the young *epigonoi* had come down to Babylon to reclaim him after Alexander's death, how much would he find to have changed since his own youth under

an Achaemenid king? This bigger question tests on a general characterization of Achaemenid rule, another difficult undertaking in the absence of usable financial detail, personal memoirs of court or satrapal life and any full sources for a satrap's local officials in action over time, above all in the fourth century BC.

Briant's major survey does attempt to give a general characterization and emphasizes 'an imperial dynamic that was founded on both the Persians' supremacy and their co-operation with the local ruling classes'.⁶ Positions of power, he suggests, 'were endowed with a genuine capacity for initiative' but were 'connected to the king through unequal relationships that were based on gifts and service-exchanges'. Those who were thus connected, 'whatever their ethnic origins', always 'considered themselves Persians in the political sense' because of their gift and service-relationships and 'common political and material interests'.

A characterization of this type is probably as much as Achaemenid evidence can at present support, but it leaves us with a very broadly-defined type of empire. Gifts, 'service'-relationships, an imperial identity which could absorb outsiders, support for the material interests of local rulers – these simple structures could also characterize the new Macedon and non-Greek empire which Philip had constructed. I am not one of the minority who believe that Philip's new Macedon (and Thrace) was being consciously modelled on the Achaemenids' example.⁷ At such a general level kings often develop similar types of rule. If Alexander adopts them too, they need not be his choice as the 'last of the Achaemenids': they may have made sense to him as a Macedonian king.

Macedonian background and the confrontation with Darius

We are not too badly informed about the self-image which Alexander projected: it was increasingly many-sided, but an Achaemenid element has recently been detected ever earlier in his career. When and how did it begin?

For Kienast, and more recently Badian, Achaemenid royal style had already influenced Philip while still in Macedon. Kienast points to similarities between institutions in Philip's new kingdom and those ascribed to the Persian empire: the corps of royal Pages (in his view) is one.⁸ Badian even proposes a religious debt: in the general Greek view (he suggests) the Persian king was regarded as an *ισόθεος* *φῶς*, a person 'equal to the gods', and so Philip would want to attain a similar status before attacking the king and his Empire.⁹ The (supposed) Persian example thus motivated Philip's eventual presentation of himself among the immortal gods in the fateful celebration at Aegae. The example was not lost on Alexander who (Badian thinks) would want to emulate his father in this sphere.

Neither case is convincing. What Kienast presents is a broad parallelism, not actual derivation: the royal Pages are not attested in Persia or as 'Persian' by origin. Monarchies do similar things and Philip was not 'Persianizing' by doing them too. Since Kienast, there has been study of the (increasing) evidence for a 'Persian' style to some of the luxury goods in Macedon (and Thrace): they belong in a general culture of material riches, but not to institutional or monarchical imitation. Their dating is not always exact and there is no doubt that most of the signs of 'Persian' influence belong after Alexander's death.¹⁰ The great hunt-painting on the double royal Tomb II at Vergina (surely Philip II's) does show a hunt in what is probably a game-park, but we should be careful of seeing it as a Persian-inspired *paradeisos*.¹¹ The word was not used for such parks in later Macedonia and these hunting-covers might simply be the kings' own idea, like the similar game-parks which were later laid out by emperors in seventh-century China.¹²

As for Philip's divine honours, the relevant precedents were Greek, whether Lysander or (possibly) Amyntas III. Badian has tried to minimize them, unconvincingly.¹³ He also side-steps the epigraphic evidence for what are called *τέμενα* of Philip at his city-foundation Philippi: the word, since Homer, refers always to a religious context.¹⁴ It is almost certain, therefore, that Philip was already being worshipped at Philippi in his lifetime in his new Macedonia. The Persian king was irrelevant to this cult and anyway the king's 'god-like' status was not what Philip aspired to. Philip had entertained Artabazus and his family (including Barsine) and had had ample occasion to establish that the Persian king was not a god and to learn (as other Greeks did) that the king's 'glory' (*kunēthē*) or *τύχη* (fortune) was an important aspect of his majesty.¹⁵ Philip did not encourage honours to his *τύχη*. His placing of his statue among those of the immortal gods did not arise from any Persian precedent or from a rivalry with the Persian King's supposedly 'god-like' status.

Instead, both Philip and Alexander began with a resoundingly *anti*-Achaemenid image: they were punishing Persian sacrilege and the 'wrongs of Xerxes'. However, both, especially Alexander, were planning to conquer and rule over Asia. According to the Greek vulgate, perhaps falsely, Alexander began by hurling his spear into Asia and symbolizing that it was 'spear-won' land.¹⁶ For some of his modern scholars, this action already had an Achaemenid-Persian reference, alluding to the royal claims that 'the spear of the Persian man has gone forth far away'.¹⁷ But the Alexander-vulgate connects it with a reference to prayers to the gods (surely local gods and Greek gods) and the overtones are Greek and heroic. Whether or not Alexander did what only the vulgate mentions here, 'spear-won' land was a slogan for his Successors, irrespective of Persian ideology.¹⁸

For the Greek city-states in western Asia, Alexander offered liberation and liberation turned out to mean the ending of tribute and the support of democracies. (Aspendus was not a Greek city state, and Alexander did not see or treat it as such.)¹⁹ Nonetheless, Pierre Debord has argued that local coinages of Greek city-states in Asia Minor then show the figure of Alexander in Persian dress, echoing a Persian satrap's.²⁰ It would be a most surprising choice, but the figures in question are surely mythical figures, not Alexanders.²¹ To these Greek city states, he was not the 'last Achaemenid' but the first to grant freedom both by supporting democrats and suspending tribute. They responded with celebrations, the games called *Alexandria* which were celebrated by the Ionian league-members and which Claude Vial considers 'certains cr  s de son vivant'.²² No Greek ever celebrated 'Darcia': these games are only the first in the great torrent of Greek festivals which were to break out in Asia (except Syria) after Alexander.

Beyond the city-states, however, Alexander did promptly follow Achaemenid precedent. Tribute continued; he appointed his own satraps and, as he wrote to Priene, the 'land I recognize to be mine' (to tax, not to own directly).²³ This continuity was not inconsistent with his publicity: Persians would, after all, be punished by losing their Empire to a new king, even if he took over their system.

Pierre Briant has emphasized this direct take-over as an aspect of Alexander's genius: it was accompanied, he argues, by a 'politique de s  duction politique' both for the Iranian elites in his path and for the local elites, whether at Sardis, Sidon, Babylon or Memphis.²⁴ Certainly, the Achaemenids gave him the local satrapal boundaries, the tax-base, the administrative centres and the initial extent of his empire. But in much of the first three years there was an alternative 's  duction', the reversal of recent or long-standing grievances against Achaemenid rule. In Greek Asia, in Caria, Sidon, Egypt and Babylon, Alexander had the wit and the opportunity to present himself as an alternative to the negative impact of the Achaemenids.²⁵ In Sardis, Alexander built a new temple and restored 'ancient laws of the Lydians': scholars have tended to dismiss this grant as a triviality, but for Alexander it probably symbolized a grant of autonomy, to go with the designation of the people of Sardis as 'free'. Not for the last time he saw his actions in Greek terms ('freedom' and 'autonomy') even though he was dealing with a non-Greek people:²⁶ the Achaemenids, not thinking in Greek terms, had not regarded the Lydians in this way. The satrap of Lydia was dead and when the garrison commander and the most powerful men of Sardis came to meet Alexander ten miles from the city, 's  duction' was probably not necessary and bilateral 'negotiating' non-existent.²⁷ It reads like a straight surrender: Alexander then rewarded the Persian commander and the envoys, not least as an example to those on his road ahead.

Those who infer negotiation and 'séduction politique' on these occasions also suggest that Alexander's awareness, and reuse, of Persian royal ideology began early and was an assistance to his rapid progress. Are they right?

In November 333, among the spoils after Issus, Alexander took Barsine, a bilingual and older Persian lady, as his concubine and honoured Darius' mother, wife and children.²⁸ Maria Brosius has proposed that 'mother of the king' was a recognized title of honour in the Achaemenid royal hierarchy and that there was also a royal 'foreign-woman' rank.²⁹ If so, Alexander was acting here with Persian royal practices in mind. But I am unpersuaded that 'mother of the king' was indeed a formal title and in Alexander's case, the only source to mention the phrase is a speech composed by Quintus Curtius.³⁰ Alexander was not adopted by Darius' mother: he honoured her because he was being chivalrous to captive royalty in a Greek fashion. As for Barsine, she had a Greek education and was very beautiful, like other noble Persian women in Greek authors' image of them.³¹ She was sexually and socially desirable. Persian court-practice did not guide him here: importantly none of Darius' womenfolk (*adulterae virginis*, according to Curtius) was as yet taken in marriage.³²

At Marathus-Amrith (now a fine archaeological site) Alexander received a letter from Darius and replied to it in terms which he wished to publicize and which are preserved at Arrian 2.14. In 1979 Briant argued that Alexander's words should be read against a background of royal Persian ideology on which he was deliberately drawing.³³ Alexander stressed that he now 'cares for' fugitives from Darius' army; his war is 'justified' by previous Persian aggression, including Philip's murder; he is conquering Asia which 'the gods are giving' to him. Briant (followed by Wieshöfer) detects implicit allusions here to an Achaemenid-Persian 'protection' of the land and its rural inhabitants and to rule in Asia by the gift of 'Asian' gods.³⁴ But the gods are surely the gods whom Alexander has been worshipping on his march, Greek ones like Athena and Zeus and, for safety's sake, a few local divinities, probably understood by him as Greek gods too.³⁵ There is no allusion to any 'gift of Ahura Mazda'. Alexander is caring for 'fugitives', people who have run away and prefer him to Darius: the point is rhetorical and Greek, not a piece of royal Persian ideology.³⁶ Alexander describes himself as 'king of Asia' but it is not a Persian royal title, and no non-Greek source attests it.³⁷ He is 'κύριος [lord] of Asia', another purely Greek phrase which he repeats after Gaugamela.³⁸ These Greek claims, I shall argue, are wide and flexible. There is no Persian borrowing here.

In 332, Darius' wife then died, apparently in childbirth. The cause of death dates the event within nine months of her capture and refutes Plutarch's dating of an overture by Darius to Alexander in spring 331 BC.³⁹

it does not support the gratuitous modern suggestion that Alexander, contrary to all ancient evidence, had had sexual relations with her and that the unborn child was his, conceived in late 332.⁴⁰ Plutarch's dating is casual and the vulgar's even later dating of the death to summer 331 is wrong. The vulgar multiplied Darius' peace-offers and wrongly put a third one during the approach to Gaugamela: the queen's death was then synchronized with this dramatic invention.⁴¹

At Sidon Alexander could capitalize on a rebellion against the satraps only ten years earlier. The Cypriot kings were more wary at first, but they then abandoned Persia too: war against a Persia-backed army was also a recent memory on the island. In Egypt, in the following winter, hostility to Persia was also a free gift to him: it had characterized much of the past eighty years. Conspicuously, Alexander appointed no single satrap here, at least initially, and in due course he would be commemorated with the old Pharaonic 'nubty' title, 'he who drives out foreigners', which implicitly equated those hated foreigners with Persians.⁴² He told Cleomenes to leave the nomarchs to govern the nomes under their control 'as had been established of old'.⁴³ Some take Arrian to mean 'as under the Persians', but in my view, Alexander's 'spin' here should be compared to the 'spin' at Sardis: they were to be left to govern as if in the ancient pre-Persian fashion. The message, then, was not 'more of the Achaemenids, unchanged', but in practice there was a major exception. As at Sardis or in non-Greek Anatolia, 'the taxes', the existing Persian ones (at least initially), were to be collected and given over to a Greek superior (in this case, Cleomenes). The realities, of course, proved rather different, not least on Cleomenes' initiative.

'Séduction', here, turned out to have a class-bias in practice, as Briant's emphasis on 'élites' well implies. The religious honours, the nomarch (not satrap) and the 'practice as of old' would particularly appeal to the men of position and the priesthood.⁴⁴ Whereas Artaxerxes III was alleged by members of the priesthood to have killed the revered Apis bull, Alexander honoured the bull with sacrifices. As we see from the Satrap's Stèle of summer 311, the authors, priests at Buto, still described the last phase of Persian rule as the 'wrongs of Xerxes' (Artaxerxes III, most probably).⁴⁵ Unlike these last Persian kings, Alexander was honoured in Egyptian temples with traditional hieroglyphic titles and representations. But the taxes, the main burden on most Egyptians, simply continued. Alexander continued them because he wanted revenues and rapid control, not the image of a 'last Achaemenid'. His smart new Alexandria had no precedent in Achaemenid Egypt. Nor did the great athletic and musical contests which tend to be overlooked. To Memphis and Alexandria (as to Susa, seven years later) competitors from all over Greece poured into Egypt for a new style of celebration, marking a new

kingdom.⁴⁶ The example would later be followed by Antigonus when he was at last a king with his new Antigonidia in north Syria.⁴⁷

As successes multiplied, how big were the new king's aims? As Alexander waited at Tyre in 331 BC, spectacular shows and Greek dramas were staged again, the first in the Levant.⁴⁸ We then find his first explicit references to Persian royal rule, its dress-code and system of gifts: revealingly, they were only made for amusement. The army was split into two to play 'Persians' against 'Macedonians', with Alexander giving the winner the right to wear Persian dress and to own villages.⁴⁹ Yet by October, according to Plutarch, 'the Persian empire, on the one hand, was destroyed, but, on the other hand, Alexander was addressed as "King of Asia".'⁵⁰ He had won his victory at Gaugamela.

E.A. Fredricksmeyer has seen a special significance in this address. 'King of Asia', he correctly observes, was not the royal title of an Achaemenid in any Eastern language. But he also argues, statistically, that it was not a usual Greek title, either, for the Persian king.⁵¹ In his view it was Alexander's own innovation and in October 331, it was being made public with Alexander's prompting. Deliberately it distinguished him from being just an Achaemenid.

Nonetheless, this theory is too formal and overstates the case. As Fredricksmeyer notes, the Persian king is indeed called 'King of Asia' in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and this instance is significant in what is a very small total of surviving uses of the title.⁵² Furthermore, Greek writers with Alexander described how the rebel Bessus was reported to be claiming to be 'King of Asia' while calling himself 'Artaxerxes', an Achaemenid king, therefore, in 330/29 BC.⁵³ Aristobulus and Onesicritus do also presume that the great Cyrus had described himself as 'King of Asia' in his (supposed) inscriptions at Pasargadae.⁵⁴ For Greeks with Alexander, the title could indeed mean 'Persian King': what, though, did it mean to Alexander?

Plutarch does not describe an official acclamation, nor was one needed to 'legitimize' Alexander: conquest was Alexander's title-deed, and lawfulness, in a procedural sense, was not his concern. Onlookers are simply imagined by Plutarch as calling him 'king of Asia': were they Greeks and Macedonians or non-Greeks in Plutarch's mental image? Some of them (despite Fredricksmeyer) might have meant 'King of the Persian Empire' if they really ever shouted such a thing. In 316 BC, onlooking 'locals', non-Greeks in Persis itself, are said at Diodorus 19.48.1 (not cited by Fredricksmeyer) to have regarded Antigonus as 'worthy of honour as a king' as if he was unanimously (ὁμοθυμῶνως) the 'lord of Asia' after his final contest against Eumenes. The phrase is ascribed here to Persians, not Greeks, but Antigonus never regarded it as a formal acclamation of legal significance. Nor did Alexander

in 331, although 'lord of Asia' was a phrase which he did use about himself. The more pertinent question is where, for him, did Asia end?

At the Hellepont, he is said (by vulgar sources) to have claimed 'Asia' by casting his spear; in the first winter, at Gordium, he was understood, in non-vulgar sources, to have earned the 'kingship of Asia'.⁵⁵ In 332 BC, he publicized the reply to Darius in which he called himself 'king of Asia' and then, in my view, he asked the god at Siwah which gods he should honour when he reached the Outer Ocean. The reason for crediting him with this question is that only in 325 BC, when he thought that he had reached Outer Ocean (in the south), did he laboriously honour the gods 'in accordance with Ammon's oracular advice'.⁵⁶ So, back in 332/1, he had asked Ammon what to do for the gods at the (presumed) edge of Ocean and Asia. 'Asia' thus included, in Alexander's view, all lands up to the Outer Ocean, including those outside the Persian Empire.⁵⁷

An excellent article by Hammond is, for once, apposite here.⁵⁸ Although Hammond also believed that the 'acclamation' after Gaugamela was 'formal' and an important validation by 'Macedonian soldiers', he rightly argues that for Alexander it meant something other than the Persians' kingship. He poses, too, a canalizing question: from Marathus, Alexander had written to Darius, telling him to come to him and reclaim his family. What if Darius had come or if in 330 BC Alexander had found him alive? His letter had said that Darius would be allowed to 'rule over others'. The letter's offer might have been ignored, but Hammond suggests that this public letter was implying a role for Darius as a sort of sub-king, who could rule locally, perhaps over Persians only; we might compare Porus, first an enemy, then an honoured king reappointed by Alexander. If so, Darius, the Achaemenid, would rule locally, but Alexander would have a new and bigger role, the king of all Asia in his grander conception. In 331, perhaps only the likes of Hephaestion yet knew the full scope of Alexander's ambition, but all attempts to see him as the 'last Achaemenid' should bear this bigger aim in mind.

From Gaugamela, Alexander went quickly to Babylon, sending advance messages (we now know) that he would not billet his troops in civilians' houses and that he would favour Esagila.⁵⁹ In our Babylonian source these messages are narrated as his own initiative and no local input is mentioned: they are not presented as the result of 'negotiations'.⁶⁰ In Curtius' rhetoric, at least, Alexander is then given a fine welcome outside Babylon. The rhetoric may be exaggerated, but not because it is representing an age-old pattern of Babylonian receptions of a conqueror: for Curtius' Latin, the rhetorical patterns of Orientalism and descriptions of the 'arrival', or *adventus*, of a hellenistic king or Roman governor are more relevant.⁶¹ As announced, Alexander did then declare that the 'shrine of Bel' should be rebuilt, and

that funds should be diverted for the purpose. Arrian's Greek rests here on sources who were present: 'rebuilding' certainly must not be mistranslated as 'redcoration'.⁶² There had been destruction, evidently of Etemanki, the huge ziggurat/Tower of Babel. Alexander's contemporaries understood it to be the work of Xerxes, the villain of their Greek campaign's slogan.⁶³ The archaeological evidence is not inconsistent with their view.⁶⁴ The Greek sources with Alexander were explicit about the need for reconstruction and Alexander's rebuilding should not be seen, one-sidedly, only as 'an ideological desideratum' of Babylonian kingship.⁶⁵ At Sardis, Priene, Ephesus and again in Egypt, Alexander (a polytheist) had already wished to favour a local god and his temple for reasons of his own: it put a distance between himself and previous Persian 'misrule'. He did it again in Babylon, to suit his campaign spin and 'seduction politique', where a Persian 'hole zero' showed in the middle of the city's greatest monument. The king list from Uruk places a king immediately before Darius III with a Babylonian name similar to the name of the Babylonian rebel who had opposed Darius I.⁶⁶ The text is fragmentary, but its sequence of subsequent kings is accurate. This Babylonian name has been suggested to be misplaced, but there is no evidence of that. The presence of this name is evidence that anti-Persian sentiment had not been dormant recently.

Quite independently the author of the Babylonian astronomical diary described Alexander at this point as 'king of all': how Alexander would have approved if he had known.⁶⁷ At Susa, in November, he then sat on the Persian kings' throne, but not as a formal ceremony: he was still not seeking 'legitimacy'.⁶⁸ At Persepolis, it was his turn (not Xerxes') to bring about 'ground zero', the result of his own destruction in the symbolic heart of Achaemenid rule. Drink and a woman may have helped the occasion along, but the burning of the Achaemenid palace was not random 'hoolliganism'.⁶⁹ It was the culmination of Alexander's publicity as a 'punisher' of Persian sacrilege. Philip, also a 'punisher', would have done the same. Persepolis had been emptied of treasure before the order was given. Peter Green (and, following him, Briant) were wrong to conclude that Alexander had been intending to hold a New Year Festival on the Persian royal model, and that only when this plan was frustrated did he burn the place instead.⁷⁰ Immediately, the surrounding site had been plundered and before the burning it had been laboriously emptied: he was not planning a New Year festival in an empty shell. He had also taken over Pasargadae where he learned of Cyrus' royal example: Plutarch implies that already he gave the traditional Cyrus-coin to the local Persian women.⁷¹ Even if he did (and I doubt if Plutarch is right), he made no attempt to hold a 'royal rite' of investiture there or to take Cyrus' royal insignia.⁷²

Only after the burning of Persepolis was the campaign's spin to change. In 1973, I emphasized the first stirrings in our evidence, not in Alexander's letter of 332 BC or in an 'enthronement' at Susa or a 'New Year' festival at Persepolis: Plutarch tells us how Alexander pondered a fallen statue of Xerxes in a Persian palace, evidently Persepolis, and wondered whether or not to re-erect it.⁷³ He left it lying, however. It is the first sign of his dilemma, between January and May 330: in early summer, the campaign of revenge was then ended.

Arrian correctly places the change before the capture of Darius (locating the concomitant dismissal of allied troops at Ecbatana), although the vulgarate (unwisely followed by Bosworth in 1983) delayed it until Darius' body had been captured.⁷⁴ Arrian's version is not only preferable as the *difficilior lectio*: it makes the necessary sense. At Ecbatana, Alexander still could not know that Darius would only be captured when dead. If he were to be taken alive Alexander would need to accommodate him or even (with Hammond) to reinstate him. A continuing slogan of 'revenge' would be an obstacle. So, he ended it publicly before capturing Darius, and new possibilities opened.

Down until June 330, however, the 'last Achaemenid' had not been Alexander's image at all. When Wieshöfer poses the question, 'Woher rühre Alexanders Bemühen, sich so "achämenidisch" zu geben?' in 333–331 BC, the answer is that the question is a false one.⁷⁵ Alexander had not presented himself personally in the guise or ideology of a Persian king, except once for fun (playing games in early 331). He had reappointed satraps, Darius' men (since October 331), but had also taken the command of troops and money away from them. He had not conquered Cappadocia or Pontus: he had flattened Tyre and Gaza and had built the first new city in Egypt for centuries. In Cilicia, some have seen a deliberate element of Achaemenid continuity in coin types being struck by Alexander's satrap Balacrus. In fact, one element (the shields on some of these coins) are of the 'Boeotian', and not the Persian, type and another, the Persian warrior on the small coins' reverse, is of uncertain date (it may not be Balacrus' at all) and of uncertain purpose.⁷⁶ It would take much more than a touch of Persian imagery on one side of a local Cilician obol to turn Alexander into a 'legitimate Achaemenid heir' at this date. He had ruined Persepolis; he had no Persian wife; he had not sacrificed to Ahura Mazda or honoured the Magi; admittedly there was nothing to read in everyday Persian, but he had not even learned to speak the language and so he could not understand, from a first-hand source, what Persian kingship was really about.

After Darius: Alexander in Eastern Iran

When Darius was found dead, the important changes of style begin. Alexander's vast aim ('all Asia') had not changed, but neither had one of his

talents, an adroit use of spin. Darius' dead body was therefore honoured and in the subsequent weeks important Persian noblemen began to join him. In Parthia, he then took on items of Persian dress.⁷⁷ For Bosworth, in 1980, a main reason for this change was his receipt of news of a real 'last Achaemenid', Bessus, now to the east of him.⁷⁸ Bessus was calling himself the king of Asia as a new Artaxerxes (to us, the fifth). So Alexander decided to adopt a similar costume to that of Bessus.

However, Bosworth's reactive minimalism is wrong here. Alexander had already taken on his new attire in Parthia and only afterwards, on entering Arelia, did he hear the news about Bessus.⁷⁹ Nor was his dress a proper response to Bessus' new style: he did not wear an upright tiara himself. On this point, what we find in Arrian 4.7 is Arrian's own rhetoric and, as scholars have rightly recognized, we should trust the careful Eratosthenes instead.⁸⁰ Already, without knowing about Bessus, Alexander had adopted bits of Persian style: they reflected the change in his spin, his self-image as a new-style king of all Asia and the presence of Persians with new roles in his entourage. 'New style' is the right phrase, here. The Achaemenid style (according to Xenophon) had been for a diadem to be worn by the royal kinsmen too: it was not the marker of a king.⁸¹ But from 330 BC onwards none of the Companions wore it, and Alexander monopolized it instead: perhaps a diadem had Greek connotations of monarchy for him, not least through the recent precedent of the 'rulers', or tyrants, in Greek Syracuse.⁸² However, he did wear a purple tunic with a white centre-piece (Darius is shown wearing one too in the well-observed Alexander mosaic).⁸³ According to Diodorus he did also grant purple-edged robes to his Companions who thus resembled the previous *govvaktotai* ('Curtius' *purpurati*) at the Persian kings' court.⁸⁴ There were staff-bearers too, to control (Orientals) access to him, as to previous Persian kings.⁸⁵ According to Polyaeus (who probably ante-dates the change) there was ~~also~~ a huge royal tent in which he already held court, like the audience-tents of the Persian kings.⁸⁵ But these fragmented borrowings were only part of his image. Without the Great King's tiara, cosmetics, high heeled shoes and (it seems) an accompanying parasol, the Alexander inside the tent was not presenting himself as the new Achaemenid at all. He took on a cluster of Persian noblemen and the seductive eunuch Bagoas, but he did not yet take a royal Persian wife: Darius' female relations had been sent off to have Greek lessons.⁸⁶ Only the vulgar sources say that he took on the Persian royal concubines.

He was, however, as adept as ever at presenting himself in ways in which the various groups under his rule would wish a ruler to be seen. He 'used to say' (Curtius tells us) that he was 'wearing the spoils of the Persians': evidence for some such saying probably stood in one of Curtius' underlying sources.⁸⁷ Macedonians would like to hear him referring to his new bits of

clothing and courtliness in this detached way: probably, he himself regarded them in that light. For Persians, however, they were familiar trappings: staff-bearers, a tunic, the rite (for them) of *proskynēsis*. Curtius is also specific that for letters written to Asia he would use Darius' ring. Hammond could not believe it, but the story fits this dual phase well enough.⁸⁸ Behind him he had reappointed Iranian satraps, and letters to them would be in Aramaic (Eumenes, Laomedon and no doubt others learned to write it).⁸⁹ The 'Darius seal' would be a harmless stamp of apparent continuity on such letters. In reality the continuity was superficial. These satraps, Darius' men, no longer commanded their own troops. So far from experiencing a seamless continuity, they had a sense of a change which was enough to make most of them rebel.

The Darius seal was one more piece of 'spoils' and its use required no linguistic or conceptual understanding of Persian kingship. From autumn 330 onwards, the most recent Achaemenids, Darius III or Artaxerxes III and IV, dropped out of Alexander's main publicity. Did he, indeed, have a clear idea of an Achaemenid dynasty or 'era' at all? Herodotus had described the Achaemenids as a 'phratry' but it is remarkable (though never remarked) that our term 'the Achaemenids' is not in any surviving bit of Ctesias and is never once used by any of the Alexander-historians.⁹⁰ There were just 'kings' or 'kings of the Persians'. Alexander himself may not have thought much at this point about 'the Achaemenid dynasty'. Instead we find him parading his respect for Cyrus the Great, the king before Darius I had emphasized, indeed invented, the Achaemenid royal line. Among the Drangiani, in autumn 330, Alexander honoured the Ariaspans, or Benefactors, who were believed to have helped King Cyrus some two centuries earlier.⁹¹ No surviving Greek text before Alexander even mentions these 'Benefactors'. Alexander did not need to read one, because he now had Iranian courtiers, a eunuch and a bilingual concubine to tell him verbally about it all. However, Herodotus and Xenophon had made Cyrus famous in Greek texts which Alexander would already know. Alexander's Greek culture would thus incline him to respect the great Cyrus before all other kings, and his Iranian informants would encourage him too: Cyrus' reputation was high among Iranians, as Herodotus had discovered. Politically, to our eyes, he might more aptly have referred back to the usurping Darius I: he himself was a usurper too, and like Darius, he was setting up new military and financial divisions of responsibility in conquered Asia. But Darius I's Greek image was much less attractive and in east Iran his fame was surely as nothing when set beside Cyrus' own. Cyrus was the 'good king' in both of the constituencies which Alexander had to please. Even so Cyrus did not predominate. According to Isidorus' *Stathmoi* there was an Alexandria in Sacastene, evidently in Seistan: it should probably be identified with the later Zaranj in the fertile territory near Lake

Zarah.⁹² The Ariaspans were sited around the lower course of the Helmand river, in the fertile area, therefore, around this lake (hence their 'benefaction' of supplies to Cyrus). Isidore's evidence for the city's existence is solid enough and the case for rejecting this Alexandria as one of Alexander's own is inconclusive: if Alexander really did found it in 330 BC, respect for Cyrus did not exclude an even greater respect for his own glory too.

For P.M. Fraser, however, even the new Alexandrias in Iran are important signs of 'Iranian-Macedonian continuity'.⁹³ The existing settlement at Aracoana had been left standing, it seems, when the first of them, Alexandria-in-Arcia (Herat), had been initiated. If there was an Alexandria in Sacastene, several settlements of the Achaemenid era are known in the vicinity. The next one, Alexandria-Kandahar, was very close to a site occupied in the Achaemenid era; so was Alexandria-in-the-Caucasus. Not far from Alexandria-the-Furthest in Sogdia, there was a 'Cyropolis' which was left standing. For Fraser, 'proximity to Achaemenian centres emphasized the continuity of urban and military settlement as opposed to the destructive passage of armies', and this is one side of 'the political aspect of his foundations'.⁹⁴ But such 'continuity' was not Alexander's emphasis at all. Some of the Persian forts and outposts were simply incorporated into new Alexandrias (the building materials would be convenient) and as for Cyropolis, it was trumped by the one-upmanship of the new Alexandria, truly the 'furthest' at the point where Alexander's surveyors believed Asia and Europe to meet.⁹⁵ When Cyropolis was then implicated in the Sogdian rebellion, Alexander simply flattened it. The Alexandrias proclaimed conquest and a new king. Their message was no more one of 'continuity' than was the message of Ho Chi Minh city or a Stalinabad in central Asia.⁹⁶

Respect for good king Cyrus was only one part of Alexander's Oriental publicity at this time. The other was Semiramis, though she is much less emphasized nowadays. She was certainly no Achaemenid and even if a 'historical kernel' lay under the origins of her Greek legend, in her Greek form she was nothing other than the fiction of ignorant Greek outsiders.⁹⁷ Curtius refers to her as an even greater model for Alexander's rivalry than Cyrus; we would probably disbelieve him, but for Nearchus' important contemporary reference to Alexander's rivalry with Cyrus and Semiramis as a motivation for the disastrous march through Gedrosia.⁹⁸ In Diodorus Book Two (almost certainly based here on Ctesias) we can see the uncanny aptness of what had become the Greek Semiramis legend, if it is set beside Alexander's actions in 330-327 BC. Like Alexander she had come up to Bactria; she, too, had married there; she, too, had brought about the capture of an impregnable local rock.⁹⁹ These similarities were a free gift, surely, for publicists who could present Alexander as even greater than Asia's greatest

woman ruler. Like him she had been a passionate hunter, a 'lion queen', as Alexander was a 'lion king'. But Alexander was not claiming thereby to be the 'last of the Assyrians', and Semiramis was a Greek fantasy.¹⁰⁰

He was, nonetheless, still artful. While founding new Alexandrias, he was careful to denounce his rival, Bessus, as the murderer of King Darius; he sent him to be condemned by a 'gathering' of Medes and Persians at Ecbatana, after ordering his ears and nose to be cut off first.¹⁰¹ The punishment was a conventional Persian one for a rebel. Nonetheless, another murderer of Darius, Satibarzanes, had been appointed satrap of Arcia by Alexander only a year before: the difference was that Satibarzanes had surrendered, albeit briefly, whereas Bessus had fought on and presented himself as a true 'last Achaemenid'. Briant has well discussed this 'gathering' of Medes and Persians, observing that we do not know if it was Alexander's innovation or an Achaemenid institution and if it was the latter, what purposes it had served.¹⁰² But the punishing of Bessus was unambiguous, in style and intent. The Persian-style punishment diverted attention to Bessus the regicide, a cue which the gathering of 'Medes and Persians' would then follow. By imposing it Alexander stood forward as the one who 'avenged' and cared for their dead king Darius, while Bessus was denied the claim to have been king at all. Respect for the Achaemenid, here, was pointedly adopted so as to make plain who the 'last' Achaemenid had really been.

Conquests continued, months passed and in Iranian lands, far from Pella, we must not assume that Alexander's orientalizing remained static meanwhile. It was probably in winter 328/7, when reinforcements arrived from the West, that Alexander rearranged his high command: the main change concerned the hipparchus.¹⁰³ Since autumn 330 there had been two top hipparchs, but one of them, Cleitus, was now to be satrap of Bactria. By autumn 327 we find former infantry-commanders as hipparchs, no longer two but at least six. The other grand hipparch, Hephæstion, had thus needed a new 'title of distinction' when the new number of hipparchs came in: it was, I believe, in winter 328/7 that he became the chiliarch, the title which we know he held at his death. At the Achaemenid court, the last attested chiliarch had been a commander of some of the king's cavalry: Alexander had chosen a Persian royal title for his friend.¹⁰⁴ Similarly it is surely not an error on Arrian's part when he tells how Alexander promised '300 daries', Persian coins, to the soldiers who climbed the Sogdian rock. The choice is probably not too significant, as the coins were conveniently to hand, a resource in his possession rather than an ideological statement of Persian continuity.¹⁰⁵ But the subsequent marriage to Roxane was different. It was a combination of desire and politics with the further possibility of a semi-Iranian heir.¹⁰⁶ According to Curtius, the wedding was celebrated

in the Macedonian fashion, but his rhetorical phrasing is not decisive: an Iranian element is equally possible.¹⁰⁷

What is certain is that Alexander then went even further and experimented with the imposition of *proskynēsis* on a selected group of Macedonians (and at least one Greek). Chares, a well-placed contemporary and probably a witness, is the crucial source: recent scholarship (with Bosworth and Badian) has lost the ground which others had already made secure.¹⁰⁸ The ceremony was a social one, not a religious one with deliberate links to the issue of Alexander's divine status. We know this, because after paying *proskynēsis*, each Macedonian was to receive a kiss from Alexander, the social kiss of honour between a Persian and an 'equal' Persian as already described by Herodotus.¹⁰⁹ Callisthenes' refusal, and his witty retort, are central to the episode and confirm that a kiss was essential to what happened. The kiss is proof that the ceremony was not a religious one and that Greek religious scruples were not at issue: gods do not give kisses of honour to those who worship them, nor do 'god-like' mortals.¹¹⁰ The intended reference was social and Persian, although the combination of a kiss and a gesture for one and the same individual was probably Alexander's innovation in view of the delicacy of the experiment.

With a chiliarch at court and *proskynēsis* from one and all, the previous 'dual phase' would have shifted decisively. The shift has even been detected in the style of Alexander's favourite sport: hunting. The aggrieved page, Hemolaus, had killed a wild boar before Alexander could kill it himself.¹¹¹ Such a pre-emptive strike had been an offence punishable by previous Persian kings, but before we infer that Alexander was following 'Persian custom' here, we must remember that no source says so and that it may simply have been punished as 'impudence': surely Philip would also have punished such behaviour on a hunt.¹¹² Meanwhile an anecdote, well placed in Curtius, reminds us of the contrasting style which Alexander's Macedonian and western soldiers had appreciated in the previous months. Up in Sogdiana, a cold, exhausted soldier had approached the fire by which Alexander was sitting: unrecognized by him, Alexander gave him his seat.¹¹³ The unnamed soldier may be the historian's cliché: the story is told with Curtius' rhetoric and neatly placed before the marriage to Roxane. But there was surely an earlier Alexander-source for the incident, and Curtius' rhetoric does emphasize the un-Achaemenid side to the king's style very well. 'Do you not see, his Alexander tells the soldier, 'how much better your lives are than the Persians' under their king? For Persians, it would be a capital offence to have sat on the seat of a king; for you, it has saved your life.'

For the courtiers, at least, the planned *proskynēsis* would have ended this easy, accessible phase. But Callisthenes' refusal deflated the plan, and the conspiracy so soon afterwards showed Alexander that any further

Achaemenid-Persian initiatives would be unacceptable if extended to his compatriots. There could be symbolic gestures for his Iranian subjects, but after inclining towards a single Persian style for one and all, he had to pull back. The 'last of the Achaemenids' was further away from him than ever.

Perhaps it was after this failure that Alexander ordered the recruitment of 30,000 Iranian boys, eventually to be called his *epigonoi*.¹¹⁴ It is a shame that Curtius' precise placing of this order cannot be trusted: the affair may have been kept back by him so as to be the immediate antecedent to the attempt to impose *proskynēsis* (with 'divine' implications in Curtius' mistaken view) and then the Pages' Plot before the invasion of India. Perhaps this re-ordering of events is why the recruiting of the *epigonoi* precedes the *proskynēsis* affair in his text. According to Plutarch, the boys were to be trained in ἐλάνυα νόμιματα (Greek letters) and to be organized by the satraps through the newly-founded cities: they were to be warriors, but in the Macedonian style of war. This emphasis on 'Greek upbringing' might belong more aptly after the debacle over *proskynēsis* when the Pages' conspiracy had made the favour for 'Persian customs' much more delicate. However, the chronology remains uncertain. For Briant, nonetheless, even these young recruits may have been an imitation of established Persian practice.¹¹⁵ Tentatively, he has suggested that Alexander might have modelled them on the Persians' enigmatic *kardakes*. According to Strabo (using, probably, an Alexander historian), young *kardakes* underwent a hardy military training which also involved them in 'thievery' (κλοπή).¹¹⁶ Briant suggests that this 'thievery' implies a Spartan-style 'ephebic' training which (in his view) might have been enforced by the Persian kings on young recruits from all over the Empire. But Strabo refers to *kardakes* only in the region of Persis; his underlying Greek source may have introduced the mention of this Spartan-style κλοπή which was simply based on its distorted 'Spartan mirage' of the Persian world. Eusebius, by contrast, quotes Theopompus (surely the historian) for the view that *kardakes* were barbarian mercenary soldiers (μισθοφόροι).¹¹⁷ In the eyes of a noble Persian, the receipt of pay, or μισθός, might indeed seem like 'theft': a proper nobleman would fight without wages. In no surviving source are 'cardaces' said to have been taught to read or write (good Persians did neither) and they are never said to have been recruited in eastern Iran. Alexander, surely, was innovating here. He was thinking ahead to a future of conquest which would need all the trained young manpower he could find. There was no Achaemenid precedent: meanwhile, as Curtius observes, the recruits were useful hostages, better in his service than out of it.

The conquests, indeed, were to be vast. In India the conquest of 'Asia' was to be a conquest as far as the Eastern Ocean, the edge of the world. Bruno Jacobs has recently revived the notion that the Achaemenids' empire ran precisely

to the river Hyphasis where the army refused to go on.¹¹⁸ Direct evidence for this view is (so far) lacking and the silence of the Alexander-sources and of the speeches delivered at this point tells against it; the conventional (and preferable) view is that by then Alexander had already gone beyond the Persians' conquests. Certainly he intended to do so, and his ambition owed nothing to Persian royal ideology or the global promises of the god Ahura Mazda. Rivalry with Philip, Aristotle's misguided geography, Alexander's own massive ambitions: these Macedonian elements were important among those which impelled him (with the favour of Ammon and the Greek gods) to go where no Achaemenid had ever dared to tread!

Return to the heartland: royal display and the two faces of Alexander's kingship

In India Alexander's vast army of 120,000 men was only fractionally Macedonian: many were Iranians, Indians and some even Egyptians and Levantines.¹¹⁹ The face of the expedition was greatly changed. Nonetheless, Alexander did not take on more of an Achaemenid style for their benefit. On his way down the Indus he did found an Alexandria on or very near an old Persian settlement, but here too what mattered was its new name.¹²⁰ His fleet down the Indus did have a Persian trierarch, but he was the only one among Macedonians and Greeks. He was Bagoas, son of Pharnuches, surely the eunuch-favourite, and hence he was accorded this sole honour; Berye was wary of the identification, but he made it hard to see why some unattracted Persian would have had this great honour instead.¹²¹ The subsequent march through Gedrosia was disastrous, and Cyrus and Semiramis were cited (allegedly even by the locals) as its forerunners.¹²² It was only when Alexander was back in Persis that Achaemenid role-play was again in evidence.

It showed in two actions: respect for the tombs of great Achaemenid kings and the giving of gold coins to the women around Pasargadae. In both, significantly, the role-model was Cyrus, not recent Achaemenid family-members. The gift of coins is most amply described by Plutarch.¹²³ According to him, Alexander did it 'twice', each time that he entered Pasargadae: if he is right (I suspect he is not), the gift in 325 BC had had a precedent in 331/330 BC. He also refers to those 'who say' that Artaxerxes III never made such a gift: whether true or not, this claim was probably made by an author contemporary with Alexander. In their view, then, Alexander was rivalling the great Cyrus, not the mean Artaxerxes. According to Plutarch Alexander went one better, giving a double gift to those women who were pregnant. The gift attaches to Alexander's encouragement of future Iranian marriages, a concern which the arrival of the Iranian *epigoni* and the Susa marriages would soon make plain. But there may be a Persian precedent,

missed by Plutarch's moralizing: in the Persepolis ration-texts, mothers of sons sometimes receive double rations.¹²⁴

Respect for Cyrus extended to his violated tomb at Pasargadae too. In Badian's recent view, Alexander had been hoping to find Cyrus' cup and cloak here and stage the traditional 'royal ritual' of a new Achaemenid king.¹²⁵ This (unattracted) plan would not only affirm his legitimacy, in the region where he had burned Persepolis: it would also assert his godlike status, the status of an *loobēos* *ῥῶς* which Philip (Badian suggests) had regarded as the status of a Persian king. But Alexander's Iranian intimates could have told him that their king was not divine, and events at the tomb refute Badian's extreme suggestion that the attendant Magi had deliberately ruined Cyrus' grave goods in order that no such ceremony could be staged again. The Magi were tortured but even so they were not found guilty: the culprit turned out to be a Macedonian.¹²⁶ Neither he nor Alexander was concerned to hold a Persian-style coronation: it is only Badian, not the sources, who credits him with the wish to hold such a thing.

There had, however, been local trouble, making a profession of respect for Cyrus timely. At Persepolis itself, the robbery of the tombs of other Persian kings was punished too. The rebellious Oxirines was held responsible: the crime was at least plausible, and was not refuted by the results of the Pasargadae inquiry.¹²⁷ In the same conciliatory mood, Peucestas was appointed satrap, a Persian-speaker (surely exceptional) and someone who would wear full Persian dress. In this Persian heartland, these gestures were well-advised: Peucestas was duly appreciated by his Persian subjects, although the main palace-rooms at Persepolis, burnt in 330 BC, were not (revealingly) to be rebuilt.¹²⁸

It is in the remaining months, however, at Susa, Ecbatana and Babylon that Alexander leaves the most 'Persian' impression on many readers of the surviving evidence. The 'apple-bearers', the Persian guards, were back in use: there were Persian archers wearing splendid costumes inside an enormous tent for royal audiences: there was a golden throne, incense and Magi, too, conducting sacrifices.¹²⁹ A few Iranians had been incorporated into the Companion nobles, a few more into the *agēnē* and many more into the surviving hipparchies of the Companion cavalry.¹³⁰ Above all there were the weddings at Susa, the marriage of 92 Companion nobles to Iranian brides in a single celebration in Persian fashion and the giving of presents to mark the day for 10,000 of the troops who had married Asian women already.¹³¹ Crowning it all there were Alexander's own two marriages: to a royal bride from each of the families of the previous Achaemenids, Darius III and Artaxerxes III.

'Inclusion' and 'partnership' were part of Alexander's implicit and explicit

spin now: if we remember the high role of individual Medes at the court of the first Achaemenids, should we see a Persian model for this spin too? Even the marriages have been seen in this light: Herodotus' apologetic tale of the Persians' fateful banquet beside Macedonian 'women' in c. 510 BC has been boldly reinterpreted by G.L. Cawkwell as a planned mass-marriage between Persians and subject Macedonian brides.¹³² But these Persian 'precedents' were way back in the early royal past, and by the 320s, there were recent non-Persian ones for this sort of merger. In 329/8 the Scythian king is said to have offered Scythian brides for Alexander's companions.¹³³ In fact there may have been no Oriental model in Alexander's own plan, beyond the 'partnership' which he independently wanted to consolidate: as a new style 'King of Asia', he would rule over a court and army which he selected as 'the best'.¹³⁴

Even in this final phase, we need to distinguish between the Persian colour of Persianizing gestures and a real revival of Achaemenid kingship. Alexander's language, religion and army commands were still Greek.¹³⁵ In his court Magi did make offerings to their gods when the gods were being honoured (at the great Opis banquet, for instance) but Alexander never offered only to their gods, or in the Persian fashion himself.¹³⁶ Magi were active because he was a polytheist, like his Persian forerunners, not a 'tolerant' king: in Asia the Persians' gods, he accepted, were active too. There is still no sign that Alexander took any interest whatsoever in the religious ideology of Persian kingship or the theology of Ahura Mazda, Mithra, Anahita, Ahriman and the other gods. In autumn 324, when his beloved Hephæstion died, Diodorus tells us that he ordered the quenching of royal fires in Asia, an act which was (allegedly) reserved in Persian tradition for the death of a king.¹³⁷ We do not know what the keepers of these fires thought of the order, but it said much for Alexander's love for Hephæstion and nothing (if Diodorus is right) for his understanding of Persian kingship.

On closer examination, the same was true of his magnificent Tent. What Chares describes for the Susa weddings Polyænus describes as Alexander's setting for giving judgements to 'barbarians', even as early as 330 BC: perhaps we should conclude only that the Wedding Tent, built for the Susa celebration, was preserved and used subsequently for royal business.¹³⁸ Inside it, however, no Persian could have thought he was revisiting the former Persian court. If we accept Heracles' presentation of an Achaemenid king's style at dinner, the king would look out at his fellow-diners through a curtain.¹³⁹ At a festival, all of them would dine in the same great hall; at drinking parties (*symposia*), twelve or so of the guests were invited from their rooms to the king's room, but while he sat on a golden throne they had to sit on the floor. They did not even drink the same wine. The underlying impression is one of extreme social distance. According to Chares, however, our best source,


Alexander had a hall of 100 couches and at the symposium he sat on his couch among all his ἰδιόθῃνοι (private friends) and made them face himself.¹⁴⁰ His wine (and water) was theirs; it seems.

As usual, the entertainments at his court were not those of a Persian king. Repeatedly Alexander held horse-races and athletic games in Asia, up in Sogdiana, in India and elsewhere.¹⁴¹ In Herodotus' view, the fame of great Greek athletes was known to the Persian king: Darius I, he implies, had known about the great Milo.¹⁴² But naked athletic exercise was out of the question in Persian culture. During the five days of celebration at Susa, 'very many both of the barbarians and the Greeks did service', Chares recounted, but apart from the amazing 'conjurers' from India, the performances were above all Greek: rhapsodes, musicians, tragic and comic actors, all in a Pan-hellenic array of talent.¹⁴³ The Achaemenids' court had seen no such thing.

The structure of the king's dinner was also quite different. Phylarchus, chiding luxury, later remarked that the daily expenditure at Alexander's court was even more than the value of the Achaemenids' jewelled gold plane tree. Agatharchides followed this line too.¹⁴⁴ Phylarchus was writing about the display at Susa in 324, and he had no statistics. A calculation is, however, given by Athenaeus which tries to establish that Alexander's 60 or so Companions ate a dinner which cost as much as one for the 15,000 on the Persian king's former dinner list: the calculation is equated into 'Italian money-terms' and is actually Athenaeus' own work.¹⁴⁵ It is not, then, evidence for a budgetary continuity which Alexander deliberately maintained. As for the Achaemenid ration-scales and payments in kind, they disappeared entirely. From an unidentified source (perhaps Chares, perhaps someone before Alexander) Polyænus suddenly cites a long and plausible list of contributions to the Persian king's dinner.¹⁴⁶ He prefixes it by saying that the list was found inscribed on a bronze pillar in the 'palace of the Persians', where 'the other laws written by Cyrus' were inscribed too. The text is valuable, but the context is not. However, his point in quoting the list is to give Alexander's reaction. Alexander rebukes the kings for such luxury and orders the pillar to be destroyed. The episode is strongly moralized, but it assumes that Alexander did indeed abandon the old dinner-regulations altogether. They disappear from history. The cost of a dinner for Alexander, we are told, was capped at only 1½ talents, way below the cost of one for an Achaemenid.¹⁴⁷

With the Persian royal dinners went a system of rewards, distributions, exactions and production which had been central to previous Achaemenid palace-life. Like the new style in Alexander's tent, his new style of winning and dining (for Companions and kinsmen) was a break with the Achaemenid practice. As we have seen throughout, such a break is not in the least surprising: Alexander was not intending to be the last Achaemenid king.

Despite the gestures of continuity, he was not 'king of kings'; he did not call Roxane, it seems, his 'queen';¹⁴⁸ significantly, he was not 'Great King', βασιλεὺς μέγας, as Greeks called the Achaemenid king. He was just 'Great', perhaps already in his lifetime.¹⁴⁹ He was a new sort of 'King of Asia', having conquered to the north east (where he thought Asia joined Europe), to the east over 'the Indians' (some of them, at least, beyond Achaemenid limits) and to the south to the Outer Ocean. The Persian supremacy had been emphasized in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions, but it was now gone. Alexander was a new-style king of Asia who would choose the 'best', irrespective of their birth or ethnic background: he was also king of the Macedonians, unlike any Achaemenid, and increasingly the Macedonians were afraid that the 'best' would not include too many of themselves.

His kingship had two faces and here it is worth comparing a later 'multifaceted' kingship, the kingship of the Norman king Roger II of Sicily (1116–54), king and (re)conqueror of south Italy and Muslim and Christian Sicily.¹⁵⁰ Roger, too, wore an Oriental robe, made of silk with interwoven eastern imagery. He was attended at times by a 'parasol'. His personal chapel in the palace at Palermo was roofed in cedar-wood (from the Lebanon), carved in Arabic fashion with inset scenes of Oriental style. He was said to have a harem. His court-secretaries sent out administrative texts in Arabic, using Arabic terms for Roger and his high officials, such as *amin*. But this Oriental face was either *bricolage*, secondary to the core of the kingship, or an administrative necessity (many in rural Sicily still spoke and read only Arabic). In no way was Roger a Muslim or a multi-faith ruler. His secretaries also communicated in Greek, which he spoke, and in the Latin which became increasingly the kingdom's administrative language. The core of his image of kingship was the Byzantine-Greek model, as shown on his coins, on the sealings of charters or in a famous mosaic-image in his senior courtier's chapel (La Martorana, in Palermo). There are Arabic inscriptions in the church-interiors, but only of Christian  Roger II also aimed to be invested and accepted as king by the Pope: his kingship was through and through Christian, but with both a Greek and Latin face.

Thus far, he is comparable with Alexander in his dual phase, at least from 330–323 BC. But Roger's religious context was revealingly different. There was no Muslim prayer at his court; Muslims were 'tolerated' in the true sense of the word (as an inferior, but permissible, faith); at the end of his reign, attempts were made to oblige prominent Muslims to convert to Christianity. Above all, there was no spin of 'parenthesis', 'inclusion' or inter-marriage, let alone of marriages in an Islamic style for ninety courtiers on a single day. Roger's own wives were all Latin Christians from the west. Inter-marriage between a Christian and an unconverted Muslim girl of

good family was out of the question. There was no new 'kingdom of the best': there was a Christian kingdom, employing and addressing a (Muslim) second best. Roger was certainly not the 'last of the Kalbids', the previous Muslim rulers in Sicily. As a result, after the Norman conquests, many Muslims (especially rich and able ones) fled the island for a Muslim land. By contrast, Babylonians, Egyptians and Iranians did not run away from Alexander in 325–323 BC.

However, the Achaemenid Empire was only a phase in Alexander's career, though its palaces happen to be the setting of what chanced to be his final years. Alexander's plans were to move on to Arabia, to explore the northern 'Ocean' (the Caspian Sea) and perhaps campaign there, arguably to campaign westwards to Libya, Carthage, and who knows where?¹⁵¹ As he left Achaemenid territory, the Persianizing gestures would have become irrelevant. There was, he thought, a long time ahead: if he conquered north Africa and crossed to Sicily, and conquered into 'Great Greece' (following his brother-in-law), Persian bowmen and tunics would have been a fading element in his image. What we see at the end of his life was still only a phase. If we picture him in Italy, Cyrus and Semiramis would have become irrelevant too: Heracles? Heracles would have been an apter role-model for a Macedonian Argead in Italy and the West; there would have been no Persian gestures if he had reached Rome and dined magnificently on the Capitol hill, but there might have been Postumii among his companions, a *toga praetexta* for Bagas and a ban on the rite of the October Horse in the late Bucephalus' honour.

When Alexander died, his officers did not decide on a Persian-style funeral. True, his funerary carriage was a *banamaza*, with Persian-style wheels, but it had a splendour and range of decoration which were surely innovations: the axle, designed as a shock-absorber, can even be traced to Indian prototypes.¹⁵² Nobody credited him with the wish to be buried in Persia, let alone at traditional Persepolis. Burial at Siwah was his rumoured wish, Aegae his Macedonian destination.¹⁵³ Darius' mother was said to have mourned his 'justice' but nobody mourned him as the 'last' of the Achaemenid kings.¹⁵⁴

The new world and its hellenistic future

After their controversial reception at Susa in 324, the new generation, the Greek-speaking Iranian young *epigonoi*, disappear from history. Perhaps some of them were recruited as the padding for the middle of the infantry-phalanx in Alexander's final year. Others remain a mystery, but – to revert to a question posed near the start of this chapter – suppose that a father had come down from, say, Ardea to reclaim his son in 323, having previously known Persepolis and Artaxerxes III, how different would it all seem to him

at Babylon? Certainly he would have had the chance to see or hear about the many new Alexandrias, at least 16 (in my view), whereas we can credit the Achaemenids with only one eponymous 'new town' in their entire history, 'Cyrpolis' back in 530 BC.¹⁵⁵ Otherwise, answers to this big question are still elusive, in the absence of sufficiently detailed evidence about the level of taxation (Justin's total of '30,000' talents for Alexander's revenue is not reliable, or detailed) and our similar ignorance about the local workings of day-to-day officialdom and privilege.¹⁵⁶ Two stories of Antimenes, the important financial official at Babylon, illustrate the problems. In one, we hear from Pseudo-Aristotle how Antimenes revived an ancient neglected law and imposed a tax of a tenth on all goods coming into Babylon: what was this neglected tithe?¹⁵⁷ Was it one in pre-Persian Babylonia, an older tithe for which we do have earlier Babylonian evidence?¹⁵⁸ Or was it a Persian Achaemenid innovation, like the tithe which had been charged on non-Greek trade in Persian-controlled Egypt in the early fifth century?¹⁵⁹ Or was it a late Achaemenid (unattested) tax, imposed in Babylon and then 'neglected' only since Gaugamela? We need to remember that we do not know: Babylonian revival or Achaemenid continuity – either (or neither) is possible.

However, the same Antimenes introduced a payment-scheme against masters' possible losses of runaway slaves.¹⁶⁰ For a yearly sum (a real 'insurance premium', the first in Greek history) a master would be assured that in the event of a runaway from the army camp, the local satrap would be ordered either to see to the slave's return or else to recompense the master for the slave's registered, assured value. We know of a Persian tax on the sale of slaves (under Darius I) but of nothing like this scheme. It is not continuity; it reminds us that Alexander's officials were not all passive or thinking only locally.¹⁶¹

At Alexander's court, the dominant language was now Greek. So it was in the army, which was totally transformed, tracing back to Philip's Macedonian genius. The ration-system and its considerable ramifications were gone for good.¹⁶² So was any ritual of kingship, any profession of a special relationship with Ahura Mazda, any distinctively Achaemenid pre-eminence for Persia and, of course, Persepolis itself and whatever royal ceremonies may have been held there under Darius or Artaxerxes III. The initiatory familiar sighs of a few Iranian 'apple-bearers', purple tunics for honoured courtiers and a big Tent were superficial *bricolage*. The royal style was new, and under Alexander's early Successors it developed further in the new direction which he had given it. Those Successors, as Bickerman brilliantly summed them up, were just 'lucky conductiers'¹⁶³: their kingdoms depended on military conquest without any one ethnic base. They were certainly not trying to be dynastic Achaemenid 'kings of Persia'. Unlike Alexander, they were not even 'kings

of the Macedonians' by birth and inheritance. They did not fill this royal void by reaching back to the Empire which had existed before Alexander's. In Iran, they made no attempt to revive the old rituals of Persian kingship. Even when the Greek interloper, Eumenes, found himself co-commanding a vast army from the 'upper satrapies', including troops from Alexander's Iranian father-in-law, neither he nor they adopted any Iranian royal style. The appeal and imagery of Eumenes' 'Alexander Tent' and its trappings had nothing to do with previous Persian ceremonial. An 'altar' (*εὐχάριον*) with fire¹⁶⁴ was laid out, but it was not a Persian fire-altar, not like the one (according to the *Cyropædica*) which might be carried in procession behind the king's chariots.¹⁶⁵ Incense was thrown onto Eumenes' altar and obeisance was then performed to the deceased Alexander 'as a god'. This honour was neither Persian nor Achaemenid, and the incense and flaming altar derived entirely from Greek religious practice.

So, too, in Persis itself the popular Macedonian satrap Peucestas could bid for the favour of his Persian troops and the other satraps' Iranian contingents by holding a magnificent banquet without any concessions to previous Achaemenid ceremonial. He held it at Persepolis, by the burnt out memorial to Alexander's 'punishment' of the Persians.¹⁶⁶ There were Persian 'curtains' and wall-hangings and all sorts of Persian carpets but they were spread on improvised couches made from leaves and branches and were used for comfort, not symbolism. The guests were arranged in four circles, mainly according to military rank. The model for such a banquet is Alexander's at Opis rather than anything known at the former Achaemenid Persepolis.¹⁶⁶ In the middle were altars for the gods, Alexander and Philip. In the old Persian empire delegations to the palaces on Persepolis' terrace had never been arranged in this way and there had never been concentric seating according to military rank with altars for gods and divinized former kings. But the participants, many of them Persians, loved the occasion which Peucestas staged.

Elsewhere, beyond the new court and army, basic structures imposed by Iran's landscape and (often) the rulers' need for revenue remained unchanged.¹⁶⁷ The *ganats* of Iran, then and now, were the foundation of agricultural and settled life:¹⁶⁸ any ruler had to perpetuate them, just as his local governors had to be men competent to deal with problems of local language. So, taxation and other duties were subcontracted to local personnel who would fulfil the demands in their local way. In Babylonia, after Alexander, we have glimpses of this continuity of a 'lower hierarchy':¹⁶⁹ we also continue to find mentions of the old Akkadian terms for land-tenure, the 'bow-land' and so forth.¹⁷⁰ They were pre-Achaemenid terms too, but in the changed military climate of the Successors and their 'colonies' we do not know what

the function and meaning of these traditional descriptions of tenure had become. We also find Iranian-based terms for treasurer (*yağmōrīnāde*) and other underlings still being used in early hellenistic Babylonia.¹⁷¹ But the top levels of the financial hierarchy were what mattered, because they set the overall demands on the functionaries below: where we have evidence the high levels are always in Greek or Macedonian hands.¹⁷² Satraps under Alexander had frequently lost control of finances (as they did of troops) but they never lost them to a non-Greek Oriental. There had also been losses of property. Under Alexander, this crucial question is almost never addressed by our sources. We find Parmenion owning the former 'house of Bagoas', but perhaps because this Bagoas had died.¹⁷³ Otherwise we simply do not know how much, if any, Iranian property in the satrapies was 'given' to Macedonians before 323.¹⁷⁴ We then find Eumenes giving land to his friends (and also, as Briant observes, the un-Achaemenid honour of hats).¹⁷⁵ Antigonus did the same on occasion: the major evidence is Mnēsīmachus' big Lydian estate, attested epigraphically at Sardis. Antigonus had given a ruling about it and had presumably made the original gift, although he might also (in my view) confiscate it if Mnēsīmachus ever fell out with him.¹⁷⁶

Such changes at the top are one reason for not generalizing from a particularly well-studied test case: Judaea, in and immediately after Alexander's reign. In a superb summing-up, Bickerman concluded that 'the idea of a sharp separation between the "Persian" and the "Greek" periods in Jewish history derives from the [later prophetic author] Daniel'.¹⁷⁷ To explain the origins of the persecution in the 160s BC, this author resorted to

the (originally Persian) idea of successive world empires... Babylonia, Media, Persia and Macedonia. It was the nationalist delirium of post-Napoleonic Europe that transformed Daniel's purely political arrangement into a succession of ethnic and cultural units: the Orientals, the Greeks and then the Romans.

In Bickerman's view

ancient empires were neither willing nor able to change the traditional structures of subject-cities, villages and tribes. Thus [in Judaea] the privileges obtained from the Persian kings remained essentially in force under Macedonian rulers and Roman emperors alike.

Bickerman extended his view also to 'the Tyrians', but surely here Alexander's total sack and resettlement of Tyre did mark a genuine new age with new structures and eventually, new 'ethnic and cultural units'.¹⁷⁸ Judaea had been different, an unvisited little region, irrelevant to Alexander's concerns. Elsewhere, his Alexandrias and his explicit aim of 'pacifying' the tribal Cossaeans in central Iran by settling them in new *poles* do show a willingness to 'change the traditional structures'.¹⁷⁹

Nationalism, and its distortions, concerned Bickerman: colonialism and cultural imperialism concern many of us, in a post-colonial age. But just because we can now detect colonialism in modern history-writing about Alexander since the nineteenth century, we risk ignoring that 'Orientalism' and 'cultural superiority' were in fact already present in Alexander and his entourage. Their Semiramis was an Orientalist mirage. In eastern Iran, Alexander banned the placing (and exposure) of the dead inside settled towns: it disgusted him.¹⁸⁰ Surveyors in his army measured distances in precise lengths of a stade, not the Persians' approximate measures by time: we then find Greek 'distance-markers' near Persepolis and at Pasagadae, inscribed on Achaemenid-Persian limestone blocks, broken off and moved from the parapet of a palace-wall or staircase, an eloquent re-use of them.¹⁸¹ Alexander considered that the coast and the islands of the Persian Gulf could be (or 'were') 'no less prosperous' than Phoenicia, so he ordered them to be settled with Phoenicians, to develop them, therefore, even without any economic theory of development.¹⁸² On the Tigris, Alexander declared the 'character' to be 'devices' unbefitting those who were 'militarily supreme': he may have misunderstood their function, but he was praised in Greek for 'cutting through them' without difficulty.¹⁸³ By a clever change, he also planned to alter the water-course on the lower Euphrates so as to 'help the land of Assyria' and dispense with a yearly labour which used to preoccupy 'more than 10,000 Assyrians for more than two months'.¹⁸⁴ Improving an under-exploited and cumbersome East was already part of the Alexander-histories, because it was part of Alexander's own outlook and self-image.

Meanwhile, the kingship and the court were transformed and there was the massive presence of a new-style army. Even in 323 BC the Iranian father of our *epigonos* at Susa would have noticed a new economic unit: newly-minted coinage, not just in gold but in quantities of silver and bronze.¹⁸⁵ There were still daries in circulation, but now there were double-sized new daries too (surely in Alexander's later years): they were struck in a denomination (16.6–16.8 grams) which was not, typically, an exact continuity.¹⁸⁶ There were Greek-inscribed images on the many new coins, one of which showed Alexander victorious in India and another (if the newly-found gold coin is genuine) Alexander himself.¹⁸⁷ The faceless, repetitive daric was eclipsed: there was a new mint at Susa and several new mints in the former Empire's western coastal fringe. New Alexander-coin was in a new flood of circulation in 324/3 BC, paying off mercenaries, paying for the performing talent at the festivals and probably paying some of the agents and suppliers for buildings which were connected with anything from the king's dead male lover to new ships in Babylonia.¹⁸⁸ With Alexander (as never in Achaemenid Persia) parts of Iran became connected to monetary exchange (not bullion) on a much more pervasive scale.

Notoriously, Alexander had reappointed Darius' former satraps to their satrapies from October 331 until Satibarzanes' rude rebellion in late 330. They had not been left in command of armies, but when Alexander disappeared eastwards, one after another the majority rebelled. Badian and others have listed seven separate Iranian rebels, executed ^{235/4} by Alexander on his return: we can add more, both then and earlier. Some of them were certainly of noble family and one, Baryaxes, had ²³⁶himself 'king of the Persians and Medes', wearing his tiara upright.¹⁹⁰ These rebels were not, however, representative of a wider 'national' Iranian discontent. Orxines, descended from the old Seven Families, was executed for allowing temples and royal tombs to have been plundered: if the charge is correct, the Achaemenid kings were not exactly sacrosanct for him.¹⁹¹ Baryaxes was captured by the Iranian Artropates (probably a Persian) and handed over: this attempted king had not won very widespread support, it seems.¹⁹² For most of them (not Satibarzanes) the crucial point was that Alexander was very far away, reported missing or dead. They were opportunists, acting (they believed) in a vacuum. How far they revolted because Alexander's new 'kingdom of Asia' was ideologically repugnant to them is unknown.

'Repugnance' was not the only reaction, because others stayed loyal to it, Phrataphernes conspicuously, and Artropates too. Above all, there was no further Iranian rebellion, let alone a nationalist backlash when Alexander died and his Successors presented a golden opportunity for one by fighting among themselves.¹⁹³ Instead, Iranian troops obediently followed Alexander's eastern satraps.¹⁹⁴ They also came to fight for Eumenes: the size of Antigonus' armies is only explicable if they had a strong Asian-Iranian component too; in Persis itself, local Persians spontaneously hailed Antigonus as 'king' after the victory over Eumenes.¹⁹⁵ Thousands of Persians in Persis came to fight for Peucestas with Eumenes and the satraps. He had learned Persian, he wore Persian dress, he showed a respect for them.¹⁹⁶ Whether he simply left them to run Persis as they had under Darius we do not know; before and after 330 BC its administration is unknown to us. But even when Persepolis and its social and economic demands had gone from their lives, Persians continued to give Peucestas a 'great reception'. The Persians will not obey anyone else, a most distinguished Persian told Antigonus, who killed him for this remark.¹⁹⁷ His name 'Theopios' must be Diodorus' (or Hieronymus') misunderstanding of an Iranian personal name.

We cannot, then, judge Alexander's un-Achaemenid style of kingship to be clumsy and doomed to failure in Iranian eyes. Even when Persepolis had been ruined, Iranian troops turned up by the ten thousand, even for the 'lucky condottieri' who followed after his death. We glimpse, no more, some senior individuals, the Iranian Mithridates who was brought up with flamboyant

Demetrius or Oronobares the Mede whom Antigonus made the satrap of Media in 316 BC, although the general appointed beside him was a Greek or Macedonian.¹⁹⁸ Such people joined in, even though Alexander's distinctive insistence on 'partnership' and 'inclusion' had been rapidly buried with him.

Money and plunder are always a lure, and already during the Indian invasion, thousands of local troops had joined up with Alexander, a new and promising foreign paymaster: we cannot ascribe all these recruits to forcible conscription. To a prominent Iranian's eyes, the old 'Persian supremacy' of the Achaemenid style was gone, but perhaps its other aspects, at a more general level, were still perceptible. The new king Alexander still left that initiative for independent action which Briant has suggested as an Achaemenid characteristic; there was still ample scope for 'honour' (inside his Tent, his Guards, or in a purple robe), ample chance of gifts (Alexander's generosity was immense, though perhaps less structured than an Achaemenid's) and assured recourse, or support, against a factious rival or a hostile neighbour (a major element in my view, in the nobles' acceptance of royal rule, whether Achaemenid or not).¹⁹⁹ As military force was concentrated in the hands of lethal new warriors, some Iranians of distinction may have preferred to lie low, and do nothing. But perhaps there were also many others who felt no love lost for the cruelty, injustice and economic burden of the previous Achaemenid court-structure. In western Greek Asia we find Iranians in the new age simply joining in the polis-culture which was spreading near their old estates: we find Iranians granted citizenship at Amyzon and one Mardonius, son of Artistomachus, being thanked for assisting a city synoecism in the Maeander valley, apparently near his former estates.²⁰⁰ Up at Heraclea on the Black Sea Darius III's remarkable niece, Amastris, helped with a synoecism while calling herself 'queen' in Greek on the city's coins (the first woman to do so).²⁰¹

When we do have evidence of important Iranians active again in Persis, it is numismatic, the coins of the so-called *frataraka*. Their dating is not certain, but Wiesehöfer has done most to argue that the five persons named on the coins run in a sequence from c. 210–130 BC.²⁰² Their status in this later Seleucid era remains uncertain. The Aramaic inscriptions on the coins make the first two persons *frataraka* (subordinate officers) 'of the gods', suggesting (in my view) that they were not simply Seleucid sub-governors (the Seleucids are not mentioned). On Wiesehöfer's chronology, however, the first of these *frataraka* belongs more than a hundred years after Alexander. Their iconography alludes to Achaemenid art (it was still visible locally), but the rulers do not claim the Achaemenid royal style themselves. They do not wear an upright tiara: the second of them holds a sceptre, but it is a Seleucid sceptre.

For more evidence we have to look to two separate stories in Polyaeus.²⁰³ One Seles is said to have tricked '3,000 of the Persians who were rebellious'

and whom he wanted to kill. Conversely, one Oborzus ambushed and killed '3,000 of the colonists settled in Persis'. The similar numbers in these two tales of ambush would be suspicious but for known coins associated with the second one. David Bivar has brilliantly linked Polyaenus' story with a rare issue from Persis bearing the name *Π/θωβρζ* (the Aramaic equivalent of Oborzus) and showing a figure in Persian dress and head-dress killing a Greek-style hoplite.²⁰⁴ This remarkable coin's authenticity was questioned at first (Wieshöfer's study omitted it) but on insufficient grounds: another example now exists, one side of which has been struck from a second die. Oborzus' attack on Greek colonists seems to be a reality, but even so he was not representing himself as a 'new Achaemenid'. He is not shown wearing royal dress and the Aramaic caption on the coin is not king but *kyry* (*qarēn*: commander-in-chief).

Whatever we make of these various coins and their datings, they are not the coins of 'new Achaemenids'. Their titles, dress and style do not replicate an Achaemenid king's. Not until the third of the five, Oborzus, do we find anything anti-Greek or anti-Macedonian and on Wieshöfer's chronology, Oborzus was not active until c. 190–150 BC.²⁰⁵

The names of great Achaemenid kings lived on in oral tradition, but if we look even further ahead in Persian history, we can see how much else did not, and why. Culturally, there is a clear contrast between the fate of Achaemenid culture and the fate of Sasanian Persian court-culture after its conquest by the Arabs. By then, there were Sasanid-era texts in Persian (whether written by Persians or not), and so detailed knowledge of a court culture could survive and re-surface in the 'culture wars' of the Abbasid era.²⁰⁶ The Achaemenid and Persians, by contrast, were illiterate, and their scribes' 'Old Persian' was soon unintelligible.²⁰⁷ Our best evidence for popular legend and iconography in Iranians' houses in the Achaemenid era is not archaeological. It is Greek and textual: it survives for us thanks only to the writings of Alexander's Greek courtier, Chares.²⁰⁸

The 'last Achaemenid' was not Alexander: he was either Bistranes, Ochus' son, or the little son of Darius III. It may be significant that we do not know anything more about either of them after Alexander took them over. Their after-life was to be centuries later in Western art. In his fine frescoes for the lawyer Carlo Cordellino, in 1745, it is Tiepolo who ensured that Darius' boy would live on, by showing the 'last Achaemenid' playing distractedly with a dog, while his mother and grandmother focus their gaze on Alexander, the new 'lord of Asia'.²⁰⁹

POSTSCRIPT

I was unable to use H.-U. Wiener 2007, 'Alexander – der letzte Achaimenide? Eroberungspolitik, lokale Eliten und altonientalische Traditionen im Jahr 323', *Historische Zeitschrift* 284.2, 281–310, who concentrates on Alexander's final year, gives valuable bibliography on the Babylonian side and shares the conclusions, in general, of my pp. 276, 285–93 and 302 n. 136. Nor was the tantalizing report on Aramaic texts from Bactria available when I was writing this paper, for which see now Shaul Shaked, *Le satrape de Bactriane et son gouvernement. Documents araméens du IV^e s. avant notre ère provenant de Bactriane*, Paris, 2004. Some of those texts are said to date just after Alexander's conquest, and Shaked, 'De Khulmi à Nikhšāpaya: les données des nouveaux documents araméens de Bactres sur la toponymie de la région', *CRAI* 2003, 1517–32, quotes most of Text C4 dating to 324 BC (1526–8), a great discovery. He remarks (1526) 'Peu de choses changèrent immédiatement après la conquête d'Alexandre', but the text concerns only the transport of supplies by officers in the 'lower hierarchy' with the same titles and using the same terminology as under King Artaxerxes. It thus supports my p. 291 nn. 169–171. In his 2004 publication he cites another text (pp. 43–4) dated only by Year II: it is not clear why 'par prudence' he thinks a 'date la plus récente' under Alexander should be adopted.

One other dating is most implausible. Text C1 (Shaked 2004, 16; 2003, 1518) is dated by Year I of King Artaxerxes. It mentions [B...], plausibly restored as 'Byś' = Bessus from the full occurrence of the name in exactly the same context on the verso. Shaked suggests that the Artaxerxes in the dating-formula is Artaxerxes the Fifth, i.e. Bessus himself (Artian 3.25.3 shows he took the name), and that the text belongs exactly in 330/329 BC and shows Bessus' preparations for 'une lutte comportant des dangers évidents' against the approaching Alexander. This suggestion is most implausible. Bessus cannot be called both Bessus in the text and King Artaxerxes in the dating-formula. The text belongs under Artaxerxes III or IV (Arses), surely the latter in 336/5 BC when Bessus was probably already satrap in Bactria (Artian 3.8.3 for his satrapal post there in 331 BC). Alternatively the Bessus in question may not be the satrap but a homonym. The proposed context in Shaked 2003, 1519–26, is not the right one. Shaked recognizes the problem (1520) but unlike me thinks it 'difficile de trouver une reconstruction plus vraisemblable'. It could perfectly well refer to our Bessus' travels in 336/5 BC or another Bessus then or in 359 BC.

Acknowledgements

This paper expands my conference-paper of 2004. The frequency of my discussions of the views of Briant and Bosworth is a testimony to their great contribution to Alexander studies which can sometimes progress by critical engagement with their views (as they themselves would hope). I am very grateful to Maria Brosius and John Ma for comment and criticism too.

Notes

- ¹ Briant 1979, 1414 = Briant 1982, 330.
- ² Briant 2002, 876.
- ³ Fraser 1996, 153 and 172–3; Strabo 11.11.4.
- ⁴ Waters 1996, 11–18.
- ⁵ Briant 2002, 315; Dandamaev 1967, 37–42; Weisberg 2003 70–2 (530 BC); Wünsch 1993, no. 353 (pp. 293–4, 507 BC), both referring to 'royal judges'; Bickerman 1963, 241–55, esp. 251; Holcz 2001, 241–58, an excellent study; Dandamaev 1994, 229–34 surveys continuities and changes in Persian Mesopotamia.
- ⁶ Briant 2002, 874–5.
- ⁷ Kienast 1973, 15–32.
- ⁸ Kienast 1973, 28–31.
- ⁹ Badian 1996, 11–26.
- ¹⁰ Barr-Sharrar 1986, 72–82; Paspalas 2000, 531–60.
- ¹¹ Briant 1991, 211–56, though I disagree with some of his conclusions; the man buried in the back chamber of Tomb 2 was cremated nearby; one of many refutations of the view that he was Philip III, who was given a royal burial a year after his death when he had become a decomposed corpse, not the right object for this large-scale cremation; Polyb. 31.29.4, on Macedonian game-parks.
- ¹² Hou Ching-Lang and Pirazzoli 1979, 13–50; Elliott and Ning Chia 2004, 66–83.
- ¹³ Badian 1981, 21–71; contrast Habicht 1970, 3–6, 11–17, 243–4; Friedrichsmeyer 1981, 39–61.
- ¹⁴ SEG 38.258; I am grateful to R.C.T. Parker for the point about the meaning of τέλειον.
- ¹⁵ Theopompus *FGH* 115 F 124.
- ¹⁶ Diod. 17.17.2; Justin 11.5.10.
- ¹⁷ DNa 42f. (cf. R. Schmitt), with Wiesehöfer 1994, 27 nn. 25–6; Briant 1982, 377.
- ¹⁸ Zahnt 1996, 130–47 takes the sceptical view; for the Successors, Diod. 18.39.5, 43.1; 19.85.3, 105.4; 20.76.7.
- ¹⁹ Lane Fox 2008, ch. 14; Lewis 1997, 143 n. 55; Scher 2003, 227–31.
- ²⁰ Debord 1999, 479–92.
- ²¹ So also Le Rider 2003, 235–7.
- ²² Vidal 2003, 311–29, esp. 314.
- ²³ Rhodes and Osborne no. 86, lines 10–11; Klinkert 2000, on continuation of satrapies; oral, piecemeal knowledge explains it, I think, not his proposed use of a written Persian 'Satrapenliste' (132).
- ²⁴ Briant 1999, 216.
- ²⁵ Art. 1.17.4, 18.2, 23.7–8; 2.15.6; 3.1.2, 16.3–4; Curt. 4.7.1; 5.1.19.
- ²⁶ Art. 3.27.5; 5.2.2; 6.14.2; 7.20.1.

- ²⁷ Briant 1993, 1–15 presents it differently.
- ²⁸ Curt. 3.11.24; Berve 1926, sv. Amastrius; Plut. *Alex.* 21.1–2.
- ²⁹ Brosius 1996, 21–2.
- ³⁰ Curt. 5.2.22.
- ³¹ Plut. *Alex.* 21.8–10; for the 'beauty' theme, Xen. *Cyrp.* 5.1 and Gera 1993 221–45.
- ³² Curt. 3.11.25; Plut. *Alex.* 21.1 (γράφειν).
- ³³ Briant 1980, 57–69 = 1982, 371–83.
- ³⁴ Art. 2.14.7; Briant 1982, 375–80; Wiesehöfer 1996, 105 even detects a supposed 'Achaemenid trend' in Alexander from 334 BC onwards.
- ³⁵ With Casbonne 2004, 224–5, I do not agree with Bing 1991, 151–5 on the local Cilician gods supposedly behind Curt. 3.12.27.
- ³⁶ Art. 2.14.7.
- ³⁷ Art. 2.14.9; Friedrichsmeyer 2000, 139–41.
- ³⁸ Art. 2.14.8; Lindian Chronicle *FGH* 532 F1.38.
- ³⁹ Plut. *Alex.* 30.1; Justin 11.12.6; well untangled by Berve 1926, sv. Starcira.
- ⁴⁰ Darius is said to believe his wife is still alive in summer 332 (Art. 2.25.1); the underlying Greek source assumed she was, I disagree with Bosworth 1980a, 221 who rejects a death from childbirth in, say, later summer 332. Yardley-Heckel 1997, 160–1 and Atkinson 1994, 392 also go astray here.
- ⁴¹ Curt. 4.10.18–34 alleges a death from exhaustion; Diod. 17.54.7. Art. 4.20.1–3 dates part of this tale to 333/2 BC. Briant 2003, 418–26 rightly emphasizes the varieties of stereotyping in the variant stories.
- ⁴² Hölbl 2001, 79.
- ⁴³ Art. 3.5.4.
- ⁴⁴ Lloyd 2002, 117–36; for Ptolemy I, Huss 1994, 111–17 is important.
- ⁴⁵ For translation see Mahaffy 40f. or (slightly modified) Bevan 1927, 28 f.; against the preferred datings of Fraser 1972, II, 11–12 I agree with Winnicki 1991, 164–85. Art. 3.1.2; Dionon *FGH* 690 F21; Bosworth 1980a, 262.
- ⁴⁶ Art. 3.1.4, 5.2.
- ⁴⁷ Diod. 20.108.1.
- ⁴⁸ Plut. *Alex.* 29.3–6.
- ⁴⁹ Eratosthenes *FGH* 241 F29 = Plut. *Alex.* 31.3–5.
- ⁵⁰ Plut. *Alex.* 34.1.
- ⁵¹ Friedrichsmeyer 2000, 139–43 with 140 n. 8, 160–1.
- ⁵² Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.13 with Friedrichsmeyer 2000, 140 n. 8.
- ⁵³ Art. 3.25.3.
- ⁵⁴ Strab. 15.3.7; Friedrichsmeyer 2000, 141.
- ⁵⁵ Diod. 17.17.2; Art. 2.3.6–7.
- ⁵⁶ Art. 6.19.4–5; note the perfect ἐμπύρεται, referring back (in my view) to 332/1 BC.
- ⁵⁷ Oost 1981, 265–82 is excellent here.
- ⁵⁸ Hammond 1986, 73–85.
- ⁵⁹ Bernard 1990, 525–8; van der Spek 2003, 289–9.
- ⁶⁰ Briant 2002, 862 implies 'negotiations were opened'; the translators of the cuneiform text render simply 'an order of A[lexander]'; Kuhrt 1990, 126 supposes 'complex negotiations forced on the city'.

- ⁶¹ Curt. 5.1.19–23; with his *obvium egressi*, compare descriptions of a formal *évangelion* or *adventus*, with Weinstock 1971, 295 n. 5, 289, 297. By contrast, Kuhrt 1990, 121–30 emphasizes earlier Babylonian receptions of a conqueror, but they have none of the range of Curtius' detail, helped along (surely) by his own rhetoric. Calmeyer 1990, 91–119 is excellent on Thorvaldsen's great frieze of the scene, though more can be said about its rendering in the Villa Carlotta, Como.
- ⁶² Avoukoudjev at Arr. 3.16.4 and 7.17.2 does not mean 'repair', 'restore' or 'enlarge'. Strab. 16.1.5 has 10,000 soldiers being put on the job later; Boiy 2004, 110–11 on cuneiform texts concerning Esagila, but not (so far) the Tower.
- ⁶³ Arr. 7.17.2–3; the very full study by Waerzeggers 2003–4, 150–73 does not exclude a date after 480 BC (p. 155).
- ⁶⁴ Andrew George, in a lecture summarizing the data at the British Museum Archaeological Conference, September 2005 (to be published in due course). 'Herodotus' silence' at 1.181 is not a strong counter-argument, least of all for those who discount 'Greek sources'. Van der Spek 2003, 17 is wrong to ascribe the 'legend' to one Beilephantas in 324/3 who led a deputation to Alexander and his officers. Arr. 3.16.4 locates knowledge of Xerxes' action already to 331 BC (it is not Arrian's proleptic comment, here) and Diod. 17.11.2 is somewhat questionable, anyway (17.112.3 sits ill with the weightier Arr. 3.16.4).
- ⁶⁵ I disagree with Kuhrt 1990, 127.
- ⁶⁶ Van Dijk 1962, 58 is still fundamental on this fragmentary text. I much doubt Kuhrt's 1987, 149 cautious suggestion that the name has been misplaced.
- ⁶⁷ Bernard 1990, 525 and 528; van der Spek 2003, 310–42 is full of interest on possible Babylonian views of Alexander. Among much else I doubt his interpretations of lines 13–25 of the Dynastic Prophecy (pp. 317, 326–32).
- ⁶⁸ Diod. 17.66.3; Curt. 5.2.13; Plut. *Alex.* 37.7 postdates it.
- ⁶⁹ Brosius 2003a, 183; note Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1993, 177–88. I strongly disagree with Brosius 2003, 237 who believes that it was Alexander who had turned Philip's pretext of 'revenge' (on Persia) into a 'real' reason. They both saw it as spin, and Diod. 16.35.6 is one of the examples of Philip, too, treating spin as reality. Young Cleopatra, or maybe Thais, would have urged Philip up Persepolis' staircase too.
- ⁷⁰ Green 1974, 318; Briant 1982, 384–400 opposed, rightly, by Bosworth 1980, 332.
- ⁷¹ Plut. *Mor.* 246B (81c); Arr. 6.29.9 where *ὁ δὲ τότε ἐλθὼν* implies a previous visit.
- ⁷² Plut. *Artax.* 3.1–2 with Briant 2002, 523–4 and 959.
- ⁷³ Plut. *Alex.* 37.5–6; Lane Fox 1973, 259.
- ⁷⁴ Arr. 3.19.5, misplaced by Diod. 17.74.3 and Curt. 6.2.17. Bosworth 1976, 132–6 and 1980, 335–6 reject a stop by Alexander at Ecbatana itself; Bosworth 1988b, 97 misdates the dismissal of the Greek allies.
- ⁷⁵ Wieshöfer 1994, 30.
- ⁷⁶ Casabonne 2004, 230–2 whose tentative explanation I reject. I also do not see a royal 'upright tiara' on the Hierapolis coin (ibid. 232): priests there wear a different conical tiara, reiterated on this coin, as Lightfoot 2002, 480–6 and in discussion confirms to me.
- ⁷⁷ Arr. 3.23.4; Plut. *Alex.* 45.1; Diod. 17.77.4; Curt. 6.6.1.
- ⁷⁸ Bosworth 1980b, 5–7. 'Artaxerxes IV' was Artaxerxes.
- ⁷⁹ So, too, correctly Hamilton 1987, 467–86.
- ⁸⁰ Eratosthenes, ap. Plut. *Mor.* 330A.
- ⁸¹ Xen. *Cyrp.* 8.3.13: note *καὶ νόν*.
- ⁸² Livy 24.5.4.
- ⁸³ Curt. 3.3.17; Plut. *Mor.* 330A; Xen. *Cyrp.* 8.3.13; Nagel 1982, 81 n. 17.
- ⁸⁴ Diod. 17.77.5, whereas Justin 12.3.9 opts for full purple and gold robes: for 'purple' Persians, Xen. *Anab.* 1.2.20 (I disagree with Lewis 1977, 25 n. 43) and Curt. 3.2.10, 8.3.
- ⁸⁵ Polyæn. 4.3.24; Briant 2002, 188–9, 199–203.
- ⁸⁶ Diod. 17.67.1.
- ⁸⁷ Curt. 6.6.5.
- ⁸⁸ Curt. 6.6.6; Hammond 1995, 199–203.
- ⁸⁹ Arr. 3.6.6 (Brunt wrongly deleted βασιλευσάντων: Diod. 19.23; Bosworth 1980a, 283–4).
- ⁹⁰ Hdt. 1.125.3.
- ⁹¹ Arr. 3.27.4–5, with Bosworth 1980a, 365–6; Diod. 17.81.1–2; Curt. 7.3.1–3; Apuvois in Diod. 1.94.2 should not be emended (with Bosworth) to Ἀπυνοίς so as to link them with Zoroaster.
- ⁹² Isid. *FGH* 781 F1.18, with Fraser 1996, 125–8 and 137–8 for problems of text and geography, concluding, most implausibly, that the name Alexandria was given to a city (perhaps Zairai) at a later date by a ruler (Parthian, no doubt) of Sakastene. No other Parthian naming of an Alexandria is known anywhere.
- ⁹³ Fraser 1996, 173.
- ⁹⁴ Fraser 1996, 173.
- ⁹⁵ Strab. 11.11.4; Curt. 7.6.20. Persian-style architectural debris was found at Ai Khanum. For Alexandria Opiane, on the Indus, see n. 120 below.
- ⁹⁶ The Alexander-foundations, six 'oppida' around 'Margarā' precisely described by Curt. 7.10.15, were not even discussed by Fraser 1996. They have been unconvincingly located at Termiz by Grenet and Rapin 1998, 79–89.
- ⁹⁷ Dalley 2005, 11–22 for the Assyrian 'prototype'. I reject Nagel 1982, 71, who attempts to fix her in the history of E. Iran.
- ⁹⁸ Curt. 7.6.20, 9.6.23; Arr. 6.24.2 (Brunt mistranslates the ascription, here, to Nearchus as the source).
- ⁹⁹ Diod. 2.6.14 and 16–19.
- ¹⁰⁰ Diod. 2.8.3 on lion-hunts: I doubt if Diod. 2.14.3 (the oracle of Ammon) is pre-Alexander, but if it is it is a very suggestive forerunner.
- ¹⁰¹ Arr. 4.7.3; Professor Roy Sanders tells me that the 'bleed-time' for such a mutilation is only c. 4 minutes and that the victim will live and function adequately. As a plastic surgeon, he has seen cases in modern India where the punishment was applied to women suspected of adultery.
- ¹⁰² Arr. 4.7.3; Briant 1994, 286–91.
- ¹⁰³ Brunt 1976, lxxviii–v with n. 86; I agree that the 'hipparchies' at Arr. 3.29.7 are anachronistic (for a different view, Bosworth 1988, 268–70 with n. 37).
- ¹⁰⁴ Beve 1926, s.v. Nabarzanes; Lewis 1977, 17–18; Hecker 1992, 366–70, esp. 368.
- ¹⁰⁵ Arr. 4.18.7; against Bosworth 1995, 129, I agree with Le Rider 2003, 324–5.
- ¹⁰⁶ Arr. 4.19.5, citing primary sources for the *ἐπιπνο* (desire), namely 'those who campaigned with Alexander'. Curt. 8.4.26 cites the example of Achilles.
- ¹⁰⁷ Curt. 8.4.27; I reject the 'source' postulated by Tarn 1948, 2.106–7; the reference to 'Macedonian custom' is Curtius' own rhetoric; Lane Fox 1973, 535.

¹⁰⁸ Chares *FGH* 125 F18A, with Balsdon 1950, 371–8; Bickerman 1963, 241–55 and Lane Fox 1973, 320–3, 536, refuting Bosworth 1996, 108–110, Badian 1981, 52 and 2003, 253, Worthington 2004, 140–1, 204 and Cardledge 2004, 223–4.

¹⁰⁹ Chares *FGH* 125 F14 with Hdt. 1.134.1.

¹¹⁰ Art. 4.11 is thus non-contemporary fiction; Bosworth 1995, 77–88 is mistaken.

¹¹¹ Art. 4.13.1–2; Curt. 8.6.7.

¹¹² Ctesias *FGH* 688 F14.43; against a Persian model here, I agree with Bosworth 1995, 92 ff.

¹¹³ Curt. 8.4.15–17; for another (theoretically invented) 'unknown soldier', Curt. 10.7.1–3 (Bosworth 2002, 40 takes this 'unknown ranker' to be historical).

¹¹⁴ Curt. 8.5.1; Plut. *Alex.* 47.6.

¹¹⁵ Briant 1999b, 120–4, an important study; Briant 2002, 1036–7.

¹¹⁶ Strabo 15.3.8.

¹¹⁷ Eusebius *Commentary on Iliad* 2.869. (The passage appears as fr. 105 of the comic playwright Theopompus in Kassel and Austin 1989.)

¹¹⁸ Jacobs 1994, 271.

¹¹⁹ Art. *Indica* 18.1, 19.7.

¹²⁰ Steph. Byz. sv. Opiat and Art. 6.15.2, brilliantly understood by Herzfeld 1968, 282 and independently observed by Lane Fox 1973, 383 and 359, though not remarked by Fraser 1996, 148–51.

¹²¹ Art. *Indica* 18.9 with Berve 1926, s.v. Bagoas.

¹²² Art. 6.24.2, note Eleyov ol *ētyūptoi* here.

¹²³ Plut. *Alex.* 69.1–2 and *Mor.* 246A–B; Polyacn. 7.45.2; Nic.Dam. *FGH* 90 F66; Justin 1.6.13.

¹²⁴ Brosius 1996, 171–9, excellent on mothers' rations.

¹²⁵ Badian 1996, 22–6; Briant 2002, 777 is very important, making an acute case for a 'Cyrus-investiture' for Darius III.

¹²⁶ Art. 6.29.11; Plut. *Alex.* 69.3 of which Hamilton 1969, 192 is wrongly dismissive, as is Bosworth 1988b, 54: 'it is possible that the robbery took place generations before'.

¹²⁷ Lane Fox 1973, 409, 542; Worthington 2004, 176 goes wrong here, nonetheless.

¹²⁸ Art. 6.30.2–3; Diod. 19.14.5.

¹²⁹ Polyacn. 4.3.24; Diod. 18.27.1; Phylarchus *FGH* 81 F41; Aelian *VH* 9.3; Ephiippus *FGH* 126 F5; Art. 7.11.9.

¹³⁰ Art. 7.6.3–4, correctly understood by Hammond 1983, 139–43.

¹³¹ Art. 7.4.7–8, *ἐπὶ τοῖς γάμοις*, probably 'to mark the occasion of the marriages' rather than 'for their own marriages'.

¹³² Hdt. 5.18–21; Cawkwell 2008, 60 n. 29.

¹³³ Art. 4.15.3; Curt. 8.1.9.

¹³⁴ Erosthenes ap. Strab. 1.4.9; Plut. *Alex.* 27.11, in similar vein.

¹³⁵ Plut. *Alex.* 47.6; Art. 7.12.2.

¹³⁶ Art. 7.11.8; compare Plut. *Alex.* 7.4 for his 'customary' Babylonian interpreters of omens; van der Spek 2003, 336: 'in *ἑκείνη* was a true successor to the Assyrian and Babylonian kings'. For a consultation of them in 323 BC, Diod. 17.117.4; Plut. *Alex.* 74.1; Art. 7.24.3. Sherwin-White 1987, 9 assumes Alexander was 'cognizant' of an underlying Babylonian rite and that the Greek sources are 'unfortunately garbled'. The Babylonian prophets do understand the interpreter as a bad omen, a 'substitute' or 'scapegoat' (clear in Diod. 17.117.4), but the details in Plut. *Alex.* 73 (the Greek intruder's name; the

chance event) make perfectly good sense if the man was acting off his own initiative, but Babylonian prophets interpreted it in their own way. For the entry route into Babylon and the prophecy, van der Spek 2003, 333–5: I am wary of believing Diod. 17.112.5, alleging Alexander came to 'despise' Babylonian prophecy.

¹³⁷ Diod. 17.114.4.

¹³⁸ Chares *FGH* 125 F4; Polyacn. 4.3.24; Phylarchus *FGH* 81 F41; the 'tent' at Plut. *Alex.* 57.5 was surely not elaborate.

¹³⁹ Heracles *FGH* 689 F2.

¹⁴⁰ Chares *FGH* 125 F4.

¹⁴¹ Art. 4.4.1; 5.3.6, 29.2; compare Xen. *Anab.* 4.8.25.

¹⁴² Hdt. 3.137; compare Pulydamas, at Paus. 6.5.7–9.

¹⁴³ Chares *FGH* F4.

¹⁴⁴ Phylarchus *FGH* 81 F41; Agatharchides *FGH* 86 FF2–3.

¹⁴⁵ Athen. 146C–D; Lewis 1997, 334 could offer no suggestion at all as to who may be Athenaeus' source for this calculation and conclusion; but examples cited by Braund 2000, 21 make me hold Athenaeus himself responsible.

¹⁴⁶ Polyacn. 4.3.32; Lewis 1997, 332–41; Amigues 2003, 3–60.

¹⁴⁷ Plut. *Alex.* 23.10; contrast Hdt. 7.118.

¹⁴⁸ Theopomp. *FGH* 115 F234 who revealingly does not call τὴν οὐκ οὐνοειδῆ (Roxane) the queen. Contrast, later, Anastri's coins at Heracles: Hdt. *HN* 432.

¹⁴⁹ Cagnazzi 2003, 132–43 who also suggests that μέγας at Athen. 146C is the wording of Ephiippus. I doubt that. Boiy 2004, 115 refutes Bosworth 1992, 75–9 who had suggested that Alexander installed Philip III as a 'sacral king' in Babylon in 324/3.

¹⁵⁰ Evidence in Houben 2002, 76–86 and 96–165, and Johns 1986, 11–54.

¹⁵¹ Bosworth 1988a, 187–200 on 'military plans'.

¹⁵² Diod. 18.26.5–27.5; Miller 1986, 401–11, an excellent study, esp. 411 'the King of all Asia was provided with a funeral cart constructed of a mixture of traits from his homeland and his newly-conquered Eastern world'. Goukowsky 1978, 140 on 'shock absorbers', with bibliography (Indian carts have been suggested to me by modern travellers).

¹⁵³ Diod. 18.3.5; Paus. 1.6.3.

¹⁵⁴ Curt. 10.5.19–24; Diod. 17.118.3.

¹⁵⁵ Art. 4.3.4 implies Cyropolis could hold as many as 15,000 fighting men.

¹⁵⁶ Justin 13.1.9.

¹⁵⁷ Ps. Arist. *Oec.* 1352b37; Briant 2002, 385 and 930.

¹⁵⁸ Dandamaev 2000, 215–22.

¹⁵⁹ Yardeni 1994, 67–78.

¹⁶⁰ Ps. Arist. *Oec.* 1352b32–1353a1.

¹⁶¹ Le Rider 1998, 121–40 on Antimenes in general.

¹⁶² Arguing from silence, Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993, 38 think 'we are not in a position to state categorically that Achæmenid court ceremony was abandoned'. I disagree, beginning with Alexander himself.

¹⁶³ Bickerman 1983, 3–20, esp. 7.

¹⁶⁴ Diod. 18.60.1–2; Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.12.

¹⁶⁵ Diod. 19.2.2.

¹⁶⁶ Art. 7.11.8–9; I disagree with Wiesehöfer 1994, 53 n. 30 and those who impose 'iranisches Königsopfer' and 'persische Gedankengut' on the evidence.

- ¹⁶⁷ Gardin and Gentelle 1976, 59–99 on 'un savoir-faire proprement bactrien' in land-cultivation round hellenistic Ai Khanum.
- ¹⁶⁸ Goblet 1979; de Planhol 1992, 129–42; Briant 2002, 1039.
- ¹⁶⁹ Boiy 2004, 209–10 (the *paqda*) and 214 (a *paštān* of the royal treasury, with a Babylonian-named superior, perhaps not very high up).
- ¹⁷⁰ Van der Spek 1986, 105–8, 184–5 line 6 (dated 317 BC), 186–7. For the meanings of *bit ritti* in texts after 300 BC, van der Spek 1995, 191–5.
- ¹⁷¹ Boiy 2004, 213–14, an excellent list for Babylon ('Iranian' titles include a herald, a robe-bearer, an accountant and a puzzling *paṣṣānu*, 'the first?').
- ¹⁷² At Ai Khanum, Rapin 1987, 54: 'le premier fonctionnaire nommé est toujours un Grec'; compare Grenet 1983, 373–81 and Rapin 1983, 363 n. 75.
- ¹⁷³ Plut. *Alex.* 39, 10.
- ¹⁷⁴ The 'Gambreion' (possibly Pergamum) inscription illustrates the uncertainties: did Craterus buy or receive by royal gift his land here? It is subject to *phoros* still (assessed in gold, probably in the previous Persian system); see Müller 2003, 419–23.
- ¹⁷⁵ Plut. *Eum.* 8, 9–10; Briant 1982.
- ¹⁷⁶ *Sardis* VII.1: Descat 1985, 97–112.
- ¹⁷⁷ Bickerman 1988, 6–7.
- ¹⁷⁸ Miller 1983, 60–8 is cautious, but still opts for a 'mixed Phoenician-Greek' character for 3rd century BC Tyre.
- ¹⁷⁹ Art. *Indica* 40, 7–8.
- ¹⁸⁰ Onesicritus ap. Strab. 11, 11, 3; Plut. *Mor.* 328C talks of Alexander changing Iranian marriage-customs, rhetorically but not (I think) without some source behind it (for Iranian incestuous marriage cf. Curt. 8.2.19).
- ¹⁸¹ SEG 45, 1879–80 (Callien and Bernard 1995, 65–95) = Canali de Rossi 2004, nos. 247–8.
- ¹⁸² Art. 7.19.5 (with or without the insertion of *ūv*); Strabo 16.3.5, on banishments to this area by the Persian King.
- ¹⁸³ Art. 7.7.7: for their probable function, Briant 1986, 11–22 and 1999.
- ¹⁸⁴ Art. 7.21.5–6.
- ¹⁸⁵ Price, 1991 with the penetrating essays of Le Rider 2003 (on the gold and silver issues, but not the bronze too).
- ¹⁸⁶ Le Rider 2003, 279–84 and plate VII; Boppearachchi 2005 discusses finds which greatly increase our sample and clearly date before 323 BC.
- ¹⁸⁷ Boppearachchi 2005, whose lettering 'AB' and 'X' I gratefully ascribe to Susa 324/3 BC, fitting in with Lane Fox 1986, 87–108 (Le Rider 2003, 332–3 does not persuade me otherwise). But is the coin genuine? Dahmen 2007, 63 n. 13 thinks it is not.
- ¹⁸⁸ Le Rider 2003, 301–19; 320–3.
- ¹⁸⁹ Lane Fox 1973, 403–7 and 542; Badian 2000, 89–95 to which add Orosdars in Plut. *Alex.* 57.3 (whom Alexander is said to have shot down with arrows) and Abulites in Art. 7.4.1 (whom he speared: Plut. *Alex.* 68.7).
- ¹⁹⁰ Art. 6.29.3.
- ¹⁹¹ Art. 6.30.2; Badian 2000, 93 wrongly takes the charge to be 'desecrating and plundering Cyrus' tomb'; corrected by Lane Fox 1973, 542.
- ¹⁹² Badian 2000, 92 on Atropates/Artabâta.
- ¹⁹³ Bickerman 1966, 87–117 remains brilliant here.
- ¹⁹⁴ Diod. 19.14.5–15.1; Plut. *Eum.* 4.3, 7.1.

- ¹⁹⁵ Diod. 19.20–3, 27–9, 48.1.
- ¹⁹⁶ Diod. 19.14.5, 17.4–6, 21.3–22.
- ¹⁹⁷ Diod. 19.48.5.
- ¹⁹⁸ Plut. *Demetr.* 4; Diod. 19.46.5–47.1, 40.2, 47.4; Plut. *Eum.* 7.1.
- ¹⁹⁹ Art. 4.15.4–5; 5.18.7, 20.4, 21.3–5, 22.2; 6.16.3, all on pre-existing hostilities between local rulers before Alexander arrived.
- ²⁰⁰ Robert 1987, 344–9, with Thonemann 2003, 100–2, esp. 101 n. 27 citing SEG 35.1395 for another Iranian survivor (though an Iranian name could, in due course, be borne by a Greek).
- ²⁰¹ Strabo 12.3.10; Memnon *FGH* 434 F1.9; Wilcken, *RE* 1.1750.
- ²⁰² Wieshöfer 1994, 115–36, an excellent attempt to sort out this elusive problem.
- ²⁰³ Polyæn., 7.39–40.
- ²⁰⁴ Polyæn. 7.40; Bivar 1998, 38–9; Bivar 2005, 347–8 with 354 fig. 4; Prof. Bivar kindly confirms to me the different obverse dies (but same reverse dies) used on the two known specimens. Not a forger's 'issue', then.
- ²⁰⁵ Wieshöfer 1994, 128–9.
- ²⁰⁶ Morony 1984, 570–6, 583–4, 600–10 for bibliography.
- ²⁰⁷ Lewis 1994, 17–32: 'they saw no need to write themselves if there was someone to do it for them' (18).
- ²⁰⁸ Charas *FGH* 125 F5.
- ²⁰⁹ Morsini 1962, 29, fig. 280.

Bibliography

- Amigues, S.
2003 'Pour la table du Grand Roi', *Journal des Savants*, 3–60.
- Atkinson, J.E.
1994 *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni*, 5–7.2, Amsterdam.
- Badian, E.
1981 'The deification of Alexander the Great', in Harry J. Dell (ed.) *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki, 27–71.
- 1996 'Alexander the Great between two thrones and heaven: variations on an old theme', in Alastair Small (ed.) *Subject and Ruler: The cult of the ruling power in classical antiquity*, JRA Suppl. 17, Michigan, 11–26.
- 2000 'Conspiracies', in Bosworth and Baynham, *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, 50–95.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D.
1950 'The "divinity" of Alexander', *Historia* 1, 363–88.
- Barr-Sharrar, B.
1986 'Eastern influence on the coinage art of Macedon before the conquest of Alexander the Great', *Ancient Macedonian Archaeia Macedonia* 4, 71–82.
- Bernard, P.
1990 'Nouvelle contribution de l'épigraphie cunéiforme à l'histoire hellénistique', *BCH* 114, 513–41.
- Berve, H.
1926 *Das Alexanderreich auf Prosopographischer Grundlage*, Munich.

- Bevan, E.R.
1927 *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, London.
- Bickerman, E.J.
1963 'À propos d'un passage de Chares de Mytilène', *PdP* 18, 241–55.
1966 'The Seleucids and Achaeonids', *Atti del Congresso sul Tema: La Persia e il Mondo Greco-Romano* [Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei Quaderno 76], 87–117.
- 1983 'The Seleucid Period', in E. Yarshater, *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 3.1, Cambridge, 3–20.
- 1988 *The Jews in the Greek Age*, Harvard.
- Bing, J.D.
1991 'Sacrifice *dis praesidiibus* loci before the battle of Issus', *JHS* 111, 161–5.
- Bivar, A.D.H.
1998 *The Personalities of Mithra in Archaeology and Literature*, New York.
2005 'Mithraism: a religion for the ancient Medes', *Irish* 40, 341–58.
- Boiy, T.
2004 *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*, Leuven and Paris.
- Boppe, O. and Flandrin, P.
2005 *Le portrait d'Alexandre*, Paris.
- Bosworth, A.B.
1976 'Errors in Arrian', *CQ* n.s. 26, 117–39.
1980a *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* I, Oxford.
1980b 'Alexander and the Iranians', *JHS* 100, 1–21.
1988a *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in historical interpretation*, Oxford.
1988b *Conquest and Empire: The reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge.
1992 'Philip III Arrhidæus and the chronology of the Successors', *Chiron* 22, 55–82.
- 1995 *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander* II, Oxford.
1996 *Alexander the Great: The tragedy of triumph*, Oxford.
2002 *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, warfare and propaganda under the successors*, Oxford.
- Bosworth, A.B. and Baynham, E.J.
2000 *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Oxford.
- Braund, D.
2000 'Learning, luxury and empire: Athenaeus' Roman patron', in D. Braund and J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and his World*, Exeter, 3–22.
- Briant, P.
1979 'Des Achéménides aux rois hellénistiques: continuités et ruptures', *ASNP* 9, 1375–1414.
1980 'Conquête territoriale et stratégie idéologique: Alexandre le Grand et l'idéologie monarchique achéménide', in J. Wolski (ed.) *Colloque international sur l'idéologie monarchique dans l'antiquité*, Cracow and Warsaw, 37–83.
1982 *Rois, Tributs et Paysans*, Paris.
1986 'Alexandre et les "katriarques" du Tigre', *Mélanges M. Labrousse*, Toulouse, 11–22.
1991 'Chasses royales macédoniennes et chasses royales perses: le thème de la chasse au lion sur la Chasse de Vergina', *DHA* 17, 211–55.
- 1993 'Alexandre à Sardes', in J. Carlsen (ed.) *Alexander the Great: Reality and myth*, Rome, 1–15.
1994 'Institutions perses et institutions macédoniennes: continuités, changements et bricolage', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A.T. Kuhrt and M.C. Roort (eds.) *Achaemenid History* VIII, Leiden, 283–310.
1999a 'Alexandre et l'héritage achéménide: quelques réflexions et perspectives', in *Alexander the Great: From Macedonia to the Okanene* [Veria 27–31.5.1998], Veria, 209–17.
1999b 'The Achaemenid Empire', in K. Raftaub and N. Rosenstein (eds.) *Soldiers, Society and War in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*, Harvard, 105–28.
2002 *From Cyrus to Alexander: A history of the Persian Empire*, Eng. trans., Winona Lake, Indiana.
2003 *Darius dans l'ombre d'Alexandre*, Paris.
- Brosius, M.
1996 *Women in Ancient Persia, 559–331 BC*, Oxford.
2003a 'Why Persia became the enemy of Macedonia', in Henkelman and Kuhrt, *A Persian Perspective*, 227–38.
2003b 'Alexander and the Persians', in J. Roisman (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*, Leiden, 169–93.
- Brunn, P.A.
1976 *Arrian, edited with an English translation*, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Cagnazzi, S.
2005 'Il Grande Alessandro', *Historia* 54, 132–43.
- Callieri, P., with Bernard, P.
1995 'Une borne routière grecque de la région de Persepolis', *ChA* 65–95.
- Calmeier, P.
1990 'Die Orientalen auf Thoralidsens Alexanderfries', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and J.W. Drijvers (eds.) *Achaemenid History* V, Leiden, 91–120.
- Canali de Rossi, F.
2004 *Iscrizioni dell'estremo oriente greco*, Bonn.
- Cartledge, P.
2004 *Alexander the Great: The hunt for a new past*, London.
- Casabonne, O.
2004 *La Cilicie à l'époque achéménide*, Paris.
- Cawkwell, G.L.
2005 *The Greek Wars: The failure of Persia*, Oxford.
- Dahmen, K.
2007 *The Legend of Alexander the Great on Greek and Roman Coins*, London.
- Dalley, S.
2005 'Semitisms in history and legend', in Erich S. Gruen (ed.) *Cultural Borrowing and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*, Stuttgart, 11–22.
- Dandamaev, M.A.
1967 'Die Lehnbeziehungen in Babylonien unter den ersten Achämeniden', in G. Wissner (ed.) *Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers*, Wiesbaden, 37–42.
1994 'Achaemenid Mesopotamia: Traditions and innovations', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A.T. Kuhrt and M.C. Roort (eds.) *Achaemenid History* VIII, Leiden, 229–34.

- 2000 'Customs dues in first-millennium Babylonia', in R. Dittmann (ed.) *Variatio delectat: Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für Peter Calmeyer*, Münster, 215–22.
- Debord, P.
1999 *Myse Mineure au IV^e siècle: pouvoirs et jeux politiques*, Bordeaux.
- Descat, R.
1985 'Mésimachos, Hérodote et le système tribulaire achéménide', *REA* 87, 97–112.
- Elliot, Mark C. and Ning Chia
2004 'The Qing Hunt at Mulan', in J.A. Millward and R.W. Dunnell (eds.) *New Qing Imperial History*, London.
- Fraser, P.M.
1972 *Ptolemaic Alexandria I–III*, Oxford.
1996 *Cities of Alexander the Great*, Oxford.
- Friedrichsmeyer, E.
1981 'On the background of the ruler cult', in H.J. Dell (ed.) *Ancient Macedonia Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki, 145–56.
- 2000 'Alexander the Great and the Kingdom of Asia', in Bosworth and Baynham, *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, 136–66.
- Gardin, J.C. and Genette, P.
1976 'Irrigation et peuplement dans la plaine d'Al Khanum de l'époque achéménide à l'époque musulmane', *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient* LXXII, 59–99.
- Gera, D.L.
1993 *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, genre and literary technique*, Oxford.
- Goblet, H.
1979 *Les Qanats: Une technique d'acquisition de l'eau*, Paris.
- Goukowsky, P.
1978 *Diodore de Sicile, Bibliothèque Historique: Livre XV III*, Paris.
- Green, P.
1970 *Alexander the Great*, London.
- Genet, F. and Rapin, C.
1983 'Les inscriptions économiques de la trésorie hellénistique d'Al Khanum (Afghanistan)', *BCH* 107, 315–81.
- 1998 'Alexander, Al Khanum, Termez: remarks on the Spring campaign of 328 BC', *BAL* 12, 79–89.
- Habicht, C.
1970 *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*, Munich.
- Hamilton, J.R.
1987 'Alexander's Iranian policy', in W. Will (ed.) *Zu Alexander d. Gr.: Festschrift G. Wirth*, Amsterdam, 467–86.
- Hammond, N.G.L.
1983 'The text and the meaning of Arrian vii.6.2–5', *JHS* 103, 139–43.
1986 'The kingdom of Asia and the Persian throne', *Anichthon* 20, 73–85.
1995 'Did Alexander use one or two seals?', *Chiron* 25, 199–203.
- Heckel, W.
1992 *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, London.
- Henkelman, W. and Kuhrt, A.T. (eds.)
2003 *A Persian Perspective: Essays in memory of Helen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, Leiden.
- Herzfeld, E.
1968 *The Persian Empire: Studies in geography and ethnography of the ancient Near East*, Wiesbaden.
- Höbl, G.
2001 *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, London.
- Holz, S.E.
2001 '"To go and marry any man that you please": A study of the formulaic antecedents of the Rabbinic writ of divorce', *JNES* 60, 241–58.
- Hou, Ching-Lang and Pirzoli, M.
1979 'Les chasses d'automne de l'empereur Qianlong à Mulan', *T'oung Pao* 65, 13–50.
- Houben, H.
2002 *Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west*, Cambridge.
- Huss, W.
1994 'Das Haus des Nektanebis und das Haus des Ptolemaios', *Ancient Society* 25, 111–17.
- Jacobs, B.
1994 *Die Satrupienverwaltung im Perserreich zur Zeit Darius III.*, Wiesbaden.
- Johas, J.
1986 'I Tiroli arabi dei sovrani normani di Sicilia', *Bollettino di Numismatica* 6–7, 11–54.
- Kassel, R. and Austin, C.
1989 *Poetae comici graeci VII*, Berlin.
- Kienast, D.
1973 *Philipp von Makedonien und das Reich der Achämeniden*, Marburg.
- Klinkort, H.
2000 *Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit*, Historia Einzelschriften 145, Stuttgart.
- Kuhrt, A.T.
1987 'Survey of written sources available for the history of Babylonia under the later Achaemenids', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.) *Achaemenid History I*, Leiden, 147–58.
1990 'Alexander and Babylon', in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and J.W. Drijvers (eds.) *Achaemenid History V*, Leiden, 121–30.
- Kuhrt, A.T. and Sherwin-White, S.M.
1987 *Hellenism in the East: The interaction of Greek and non-Greek civilizations from Syria to central Asia after Alexander*, London.
- Lane Fox, R.
1973 *Alexander the Great*, London.
1996 'Text and image: Alexander the Great, coins and elephants', *BICS* 41, 87–108.
2008 *Traveling Heroes*, London.
- Le Rider, G.
1998 'Antimène de Rhodes à Babylone', *BAL* 12, 121–40.

- 2003 *Alexandre le Grand: monnaie, finances et politique*, Paris.
- Lewis, D.M.
 1977 *Sparta and Persia*, Leiden.
 1994 'The Persepolis tablets: speech, seal and script', in A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds.) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 17–32.
 1997 *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*, Cambridge.
- Lightfoot, J.L.
 2003 Lucian, *On the Syrian Goddess*, Oxford.
- Lloyd, A.B.
 2002 'The Egyptian elite in the Ptolemaic period: some hieroglyphic evidence', in D. Ogden (ed.) *The Hellenistic World: New perspectives*, Swansea, 117–36.
- Mahaffy, J.P.
 1899 *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, London.
- Millar, F.
 1983 'The Phoenician cities: a case study of hellenization', *PCPS* 209, 55–76.
- Miller, S.G.
 1986 'Alexander's funeral cart', *Ancient Macedonia/Archaea Makedonia* IV, 401–12.
- Morais, A.
 1962 *A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings of G.B. Tiepolo*, London.
- Mooney, M.
 1984 *Iraq After the Muslim Conquest*, Princeton.
- Müller, H.
 2003 'Pergamenische pergä', *Chiron* 33, 420–55.
- Nagel, W.
 1982 *Ninus und Semiramis in Sage und Geschichte: Iranische Staaten und Reiterkrieger vor Darius*, Berlin.
- Oost, S.I.
 1981 'The Alexander historians and "Asia"', in H.J. Delf (ed.) *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki, 265–82.
- Paspalas, S.A.
 2000 'On Persian-type furniture in Macedonia: the recognition and transmission of forms', *JJA* 104, 531–60.
- Planhol, X. de
 1992 'Les galeries drainantes souterraines: quelques problèmes généraux', in D. Balland (ed.) *Les eaux cathédrales: études géographiques sur les galeries drainantes souterraines*, Paris, 129–42.
- Price, M.J.
 1991 *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaios*, Zurich-London.
- Robert, L.
 1987 *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, Athens.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H.
 1993 'Alexander and Persepolis', in J. Carlsen (ed.) *Alexander the Great: Reality and myth*, Rome, 177–88.
- Scheer, T.S.
 2003 'The past in a hellenistic present: myth and local tradition', in A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 216–31.
- Sherwin-White, S.M.
 1987 'Seleucid Babylonia: a case study for the installation and development of Greek rule', in Kuhrt and Sherwin-White, *Hellenism in the East*, 1–31.
- Thonemann, P.J.
 2003 'Hellenistic inscriptions from Lydia', *EJ* 36, 95–108.
- van der Spek, R.J.
 1986 *Grondbesit in het Seleucidische Rijk*, Amsterdam.
 1995 'Land ownership in Babylonian cuneiform documents', in M.J. Geller and H. Maehler (eds.) *Legal Documents of the Hellenistic World*, London, 173–245.
- 2003 'Darius III, Alexander the Great and Babylonian scholarship', in Henkelman and Kuhrt, *A Persian Perspective*, 289–346.
- van Dijk, J.
 1962 'Die Inschriftenkunde', in H.J. Leirzen (ed.) *XVIII Fortläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka*, Berlin, 39–62.
- Vial, C.
 2003 'À propos des concours de l'Orient méditerranéen à l'époque hellénistique', in Francis Prost (ed.) *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée*, Rennes-Toulouse, 311–28.
- Waezeggers, C.
 2003/4 'The Babylonian revolts against Xerxes and the "end of archives"', *AJO* 50, 150–73.
- Waters, M.W.
 1996 'Darius and the Achaemenid line', *JHB* 10, 11–18.
- Weinstock, S.
 1971 *Divus Julius*, Oxford.
- Weisberg, D.W.
 2003 *Neo-Babylonian Texts in the Oriental Institute Collection*, Chicago.
- Wieschöfer, J.
 1994 *Die "dunklen Jahrhunderte" der Persis*, Munich.
- Winnicki, J.K.
 1991 'Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I und Seleukos I in Syrien in den Jahren 312–11 v.C., Teil II', *Ancient Society* 22, 147–202.
- Worthington, I.
 2004 *Alexander the Great: Man and God*, London.
- Wünsch, C.
 1993 *Die Urkunden des babylonischen Geschäftsmannes Iddin-Marduk: Zum Handel mit Naturalien im 6. Jhd. v.C.*, Groningen.
- Yardeni, A.
 1994 'Maritime trade and royal accountancy in an crased customs account from 475 BCE on the Abiqar scroll from Elephantine', *BASOR* 293, 67–78.
- Yardley, J.C. and Heckel, W.E.
 1997 *Justin, Epitome of the Philippic Histories of Pompeius Trogus*, I: Books 11–12, Oxford.
- Zahnt, M.
 1996 'Alexanders Übergang über den Hellespont', *Chiron* 26, 129–47.